

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5001**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<a href="#">Editorial, Satisfied (was</a>	<a href="#">xxiv</a>	<a href="#">2</a>		<a href="#">0</a>

DVJ1(subclause=0,page=xxiv,line=2):  
Capitalization within a clause or subclause title should be limited to the first word, as per the IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

List of Figures  
==>  
List of figures

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: [Accepted](#)**

List of Figures  
==>  
List of figures

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5002**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<a href="#">Editorial, Satisfied (was</a>	<a href="#">xxvi</a>	<a href="#">2</a>		<a href="#">0</a>

DVJ2(subclause=0,page=xxvi,line=2):  
Capitalization within a clause or subclause title should be limited to the first word, as per the IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

[List of Tables](#)

==>

[List of tables](#)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: [Accepted](#)**

[List of Figures](#)

==>

[List of figures](#)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5003**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**Starting Page # **3**Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table#

Section **1.4.2**

It is not proper to mark a subclause as informative (see 2005 IEEE Style Guide).

**Suggested Remedy**

Move this text to an informative Annex.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

*[In 1.4.2 Network model for mobile communications (informative), page 3, line 1, move entire subclause to new Annex F as informative text]**[ In 3. Definitions, page 10, line 16, add to end of section as:]*'**3.84 backbone network**: communication mechanism by which two or more base station (BS)s communicate to each other, and may also include communication with other networks. The method of communication for backbone networks is outside the scope of this standard.'**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified***[In 1.4.2 Network model for mobile communications (informative), page 3, line 1, move entire subclause to new Annex F as informative text]**[ In 3. Definitions, page 10, line 16, add to end of section as:]*'**3.84 backbone network**: communication mechanism by which two or more base station (BS)s communicate to each other, and may also include communication with other networks. The method of communication for backbone networks is outside the scope of this standard.'**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5004**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	9	Starting Line #	vario	Fig/Table#	Section	3
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	---	-----------------	-------	------------	---------	---

Definitions need to stand on their own, so acronyms need to be spelled out in each of the definitions. In most cases it is better to avoid using them altogether. 3.73 is an example, BS, MSS and HO need to be spelled out.

**Suggested Remedy**

Spell out the acronyms in each of the definitions. The response is that BS is widely used. However the other acronyms, SHO, MSS, etc. are not widely used and are specific only to this draft. Even BS can be misunderstood and should be spelled out. Only acronyms that are extremely well known, such as RF, RFIC, CMOS, etc. do not need to be spelled out. The IEEE staff cannot make this determination. Do the right thing and spell them out.

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation: Accepted-Modified</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	--	--------------------------

Replace "handoff" with "handover" throughout the text (5 instances)".

In Clause 4, remove the definition for "BBM - break before make"  
 In Clause 4, remove the definition for "MBB - make before break"

*[In 3. Definitions, page 9, line 1, modify identified definitions as:]*

3.5.1 neighbor BS: For any mobile station (MS), a neighbor BS is a base station (BS) (other than the serving BS) whose downlink transmission can be received by the mobile station (MS).

3.5.2 serving BS: For any mobile station (MS), the serving BS is the base station (BS) with which the mobile station (MS) has most recently completed registration at initial network-entry or during a handover (HO).

3.5.3 target BS: The base station (BS) that a mobile station (MS) intends to be registered with at the end of a handover (HO).

3.5.4 active BS: An active BS is informed of the mobile station (MS)' capabilities, security parameters, service flows and full MAC context information. For soft handover (SHO), the mobile station (MS) transmits/receives data to/from all active BSs in the active set.'

'3.71 active set: ~~Active set is applicable to SHO and FBSS.~~ The active set contains a list of active BSs to the mobile station (MS). The active set is managed by the mobile station (MS) and base station (BS). ~~The active set is applicable to soft handover (SHO) and fast BS switching (FBSS)'~~

'3.73 anchor BS: For soft handover (SHO) or fast BS switching (FBSS) supporting mobile station (MS)s, this is a base station (BS) where the mobile station (MS) is registered, synchronized ~~with~~, performs ranging ~~with~~ and monitors the downlink DL for control information. For fast BS switching (FBSS) supporting mobile station (MS), this is the serving BS that is designated to transmit/receive data to/from the mobile station (MS) at a given frame.

3.74 FA index: A network specific logical frequency assignment (FA) index assignment. FA index assignment is used in combination with operator specific configuration information provided to the mobile station (MS) in a method outside the scope of this standard.

3.75 fast BS switching (FBSS): base station (BS) switching that utilizes a fast switching mechanism to improve link quality. The mobile station (MS) is only transmitting/receiving data to/from one of the active BS (anchor BS) at any given frame. The anchor BS can change from frame to frame depending on the base station (BS) selection scheme.

- 3.76 frequency assignment (FA): A frequency assignment (FA) denotes a logical assignment of ~~downlinkDL~~ center frequency and channel bandwidth programmed to the base station (BS).
- 3.77 handover (HO): The process in which an mobile station (MS) migrates from the air-interface provided by one base station (BS) to the air-interface provided by another base station (BS).
- 3.78 group key encryption key (GKEK): ~~Encrypted by the KEK that is derived from the AK. The GKEK is a random number generated by the BS or an ASA used to encrypt the GTEKs sent in multicast messages by the BS to MSs in the same multicast group.~~
- 3.80 mobile station (MS): A subscriber station (SS) capable of communicating while in motion. A mobile station (MS) is always a subscriber station (SS) unless specifically excepted otherwise in the standard.
- 3.81 ~~Orderly~~ power down procedure: The procedure that the mobile station (MS) performs when powering down as directed by (e.g., user input or prompted by a automatic power down mechanism).
- 3.82 scanning interval: A time period intended for the mobile station (MS) to monitor neighbor BSs to determine the suitability of the base station (BS)s as targets for handover (HO).
- 3.83 soft handover (SHO): The process in which an mobile station (MS) migrates from the air-interface provided by one or more base station (BS)s to the air-interface provided by other one or more base station (BS)s. This process is accomplished in the ~~downlinkDL~~ by having two or more base station (BS)s transmitting the same MAC/PHY protocol data unit (PDU)s to the mobile station (MS) such that diversity combining can be performed by the mobile station (MS). In the ~~uplinkUL~~ it is accomplished by having two or more base station (BS)s receiving (demodulating, decoding) the same protocol data unit (PDU)s from the mobile station (MS), such that diversity combining of the received protocol data unit (PDU)s can be performed among the base station (BS)s.

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Replace "handoff" with "handover" throughout the text (5 instances)".

In Clause 4, remove the definition for "BBM - break before make"

In Clause 4, remove the definition for "MBB - make before break"

*[In 3. Definitions, page 9, line 1, modify identified definitions as:]*

3.5.1 neighbor BS: For any mobile station (MS), a neighbor BS is a base station (BS) (other than the serving BS) whose downlink transmission can be received by the mobile station (MS).

3.5.2 serving BS: For any mobile station (MS), the serving BS is the base station (BS) with which the mobile station (MS) has most recently completed registration at initial network-entry or during an handover (HO).

3.5.3 target BS: The base station (BS) that an mobile station (MS) intends to be registered with at the end of a handover (HO).

3.5.4 active BS: An active BS is informed of the mobile station (MS)'s capabilities, security parameters, service flows and full MAC context information. For soft handover (SHO), the mobile station (MS) transmits/receives data to/from all active BSs in the active set.'

'3.71 active set: ~~Active set is applicable to SHO and FBSS.~~ The active set contains a list of active BSs to the mobile station (MS). The active set is managed by the mobile station (MS) and base station (BS). ~~The active set is applicable to soft handover (SHO) and fast BS switching (FBSS).'~~'

'3.73 anchor BS: For soft handover (SHO) or fast BS switching (FBSS) supporting mobile station (MS)s, this is a base station (BS) where the mobile station (MS) is registered, synchronized ~~with~~, performs ranging ~~with~~ and monitors the downlinkDL for control information. For fast BS switching (FBSS) supporting mobile station (MS), this is the serving BS that is designated to transmit/receive data to/from the mobile station (MS) at a given frame.

3.74 FA index: A network specific logical frequency assignment (FA) index assignment. FA index assignment is used in combination with operator specific configuration information provided to the mobile station (MS) in a method outside the scope of this standard.

3.75 fast BS switching (FBSS): base station (BS) switching that utilizes a fast switching mechanism to improve link quality. The mobile station (MS) is only transmitting/receiving data to/from one of the active BS (anchor BS) at any given frame. The anchor BS can change from frame to frame depending on the base station (BS) selection scheme.

3.76 frequency assignment (FA): A frequency assignment (FA) denotes a logical assignment of downlinkDL center frequency and channel bandwidth programmed to the base station (BS).

3.77 handover (HO): The process in which an mobile station (MS) migrates from the air-interface provided by one base station (BS) to the air-interface provided by another base station (BS).

3.78 group key encryption key (GKEK): ~~Encrypted by the KEK that is derived from the AK. The GKEK is a random number generated by the BS or a network entity (for example, an ASA server) used to encrypt the GTEKs sent in multicast messages by the BS to MSs in the same multicast group.'~~

3.80 mobile station (MS): A subscriber station (SS) capable of communicating while in motion. ~~A mobile station (MS) is always a subscriber station~~

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

It is redundant to explicitly spell out all the acronyms; a usual common practice is to spell out the first instance of each acronym.

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5005**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **9** Starting Line # **51** Fig/Table# Section **3.79**)

DVJ3(subclause=3.79,page=9,line=51):  
The preserved text quality is much improved over previous versions: congratulations.

However, the new text is oftentimes self-inconsistent. The same term is spelled multiple ways, within the clause, where the subclause title, table title, and text differ from one another.

\_Please\_ have your editors establish a policy for what is capitalized, how tables are centered, etc. Then, have them spend 4-hours reviewing/fixing these editorials and others that are found. Catching these errors with 100s of reviewers is inefficient.

**Suggested Remedy**

Proofread and spell-check, throughout.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Proofread and spell-check, throughout.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5006**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	10	Starting Line #	2	Fig/Table#	Section	3.81
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	------

DVJ4(subclause=3.81,page=10,line=2):  
 Definitions are not capitalized simply because of  
 their distinct meanings. Only proper nouns (such  
 as formal document titles) should be capitalized.

**Suggested Remedy**

Orderly power down procedure:

==&gt;

orderly power down procedure:

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Orderly power down procedure:

==&gt;

orderly power down procedure:

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5007**Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon****Kim**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **011** Starting Line # **22** Fig/Table# Section **4**

I wonder if MBS stands for "mobile base station". What is mobile base station? My understanding is that MBS is generally regarded as Multicast Broadcast Service.

**Suggested Remedy**

~~MBS mobile base station~~ [multicast broadcast service](#)

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Withdrawn**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

[Comment #5008](#) resolves this issue.

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Withdrawn****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions  none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5008**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **11** Starting Line # **22** Fig/Table# Section **4**

There are two different MBS used in 16e/D8. One is for Mobile Base Station, the other is for Multicast and Broadcast Services.

This conflict has to be resolved. I propose to use MBS for Multicast and Broadcast Services. But, I am open for any other suggestions.

**Suggested Remedy**

change line 22 on page 11 to :

MBS Multicast and Broadcast Services

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

change line 22 on page 11 to :

MBS multicast and broadcast services

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

change line 22 on page 11 to :

MBS multicast and broadcast services

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5009**

Comment submitted by: Lei

Wang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	12	Starting Line #	1	Fig/Table#	Section	5
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	---

We are concerned that the 802.16 protocol cannot easily be extendable to transport new protocols over the 802.16 air interface. It would appear that a convergence sublayer is needed for every type of protocol transported over the 802.16 MAC. Every time a new protocol type needs to be transported over the 802.16 air interface, the 802.16 standard needs to be modified to define a new CS type.

We propose a generic Packet convergence sublayer that can support multi-protocols and which does not require further modification to the 802.16 standard to support new protocols. We believe that this was the intention of the Packet CS.

**Suggested Remedy**

see contribution [C80216e-05\\_283](#).

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

[Ruled out of scope \(this is a new feature\).](#)

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5010**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ5(subclause=6.3.2.1.1,page=14,line=6): Capitalization within a clause or subclause title should be limited to the first word, as per the IEEE Style Guide.

Starting Page # **14** Starting Line # **6**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Generic MAC Header  
==>  
Generic MAC header

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Generic MAC Header  
==>  
Generic MAC header

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5011**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>		<b>6.3.2.1.1</b>

DVJ6(subclause=6.3.2.1.1,page=15,line=6):  
Capitalization within table titles should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Type Field Encodings for  
=>  
Type field encodings for

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Type Field Encodings for  
=>  
Type field encodings for

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5012**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	Starting Page #	<b>15</b>	Starting Line #	<b>9</b>	Fig/Table#	Section	<b>6.3.2.1.1</b>
---------	------	----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------	-----------------	----------	------------	---------	------------------

DVJ7(subclause=6.3.2.1.1,page=15,line=9):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Reference  
Figure  
==>  
Reference  
figure

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reference  
Figure  
==>  
Reference  
figure

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5013**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	Starting Page #	<b>15</b>	Starting Line #	<b>9</b>	Fig/Table#	Section	<b>6.3.2.1.1</b>
---------	------	----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------	-----------------	----------	------------	---------	------------------

DVJ8(subclause=6.3.2.1.1,page=15,line=9):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Reference  
Table  
==>  
Reference  
table

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reference  
Table  
==>  
Reference  
table

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5014**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ9(subclause=6.3.2.1.1,page=15,line=9): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

Starting Page # **15** Starting Line # **9**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Reference Table

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Reference Table

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5015**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ10(subclause=6.3.2.1.1,page=15,line=9): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

Starting Page # **15** Starting Line # **9**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Reference Figure

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Reference Figure

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5016**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ11(subclause=6.3.2.1.1,page=15,line=9): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

Starting Page # **15** Starting Line # **9**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: type field (3 bits)

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: type field (3 bits)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5017**

Comment submitted by: Brian

Johnson

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial	17	28	7a	6.3.2.1.2.1.2

The "bandwidth request and UL Tx power report header" section has incorrect description. It is the same description as "bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change request header" section which looks like an editorial mistake in adopting the resolution of comment 4011 in IEEE 802.16-05/023r6 comment database

Specifically, the text starting on page 17 line 28 going through to the end of the section on page 19 line 43, including table 7a, is incorrect. It seems to be the exact same text as appears in section 6.3.2.1.2.1.3 page 19 line 37 through page 20 line 42.

**Suggested Remedy**

The text starting on page 17 line 28 going through to the end of the section on page 19 line 43, including table 7a, needs to properly reflect the text changes in contribution C802.16e-05/210r2 that were accepted in comment 4011 in IEEE 802.16-05/023r6 comment database

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superseded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment 5023.](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5018**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **17**Starting Line # **28**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.2**

Comment #4011 resolution in session #37 was not fully reflected on IEEE802.16e/D8.

-----

This section is for 'Bandwidth request and UL Tx power request' header. Therefore some descriptions of 'Bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change request' should be deleted from this section.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace line 28-line 39 with

The Bandwidth request and **UL Tx power report** ~~downlink burst profile change request~~ header shall have the following properties:

- a) This is a MAC signaling header type 1.
- b) The CID shall indicate the connection for which uplink bandwidth is requested.
- c) The allowed type for Bandwidth request and **UL Tx power report** ~~downlink burst profile change request~~ is defined in Table 5a. The requested bandwidth is incremental.

The fields of the Bandwidth request and **UL Tx power report** ~~downlink burst profile change request~~ header are defined in Table 7a ~~b~~.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5023.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5019**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **017** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.2**

Texts from line 28, page 17 to 43, page 18 are duplicate. The same text appears in the next subclause.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove the text from line 28, page 17 to 43, page 18.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superseded****

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

See comment 5023.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5020**

Comment submitted by: Rajesh

Bhalla

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	18	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.1.2.1.3
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	------------	---------	---------------

Since "preferred DIUC" is not longer reported in BAndwidth request and downlink burst profile change request header, there no need to include DCD change indication.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove DCD change indication from Bandwith request and downlink burst profile change request header. Change DCD change indication bit to reserve bit in figure 20b and table 7b. Remove the description on Page 20, line 35

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

Change:

6.3.2.1.2.1.3 Bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change request header  
Bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change request (BR-DBPCR) PDU shall consist of bandwidth request and DL burst profile change request header alone, and shall not contain a payload. The bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change request header is illustrated in Figure 20b.

to:

6.3.2.1.2.1.3 Bandwidth request and CINR report header  
Bandwidth request and CINR report PDU shall consist of bandwidth request and CINR report header alone, and shall not contain a payload (see Figure 20b).

Change:

Figure 20b—Bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change

to:

Figure 20b—Bandwidth request and CINR report

**Reason for Recommendation**

The definition of DCD change indication for this table has a different meaning from what the commentor is saying. For the definition that is being referred, it is not needed, but for the actual definition, the bit is needed and useful.

The actual definition is that there was a change in state, and this bit is used to report the change in state.

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Change:

6.3.2.1.2.1.3 Bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change request header  
Bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change request (BR-DBPCR) PDU shall consist of bandwidth request and DL burst profile change request header alone, and shall not contain a payload. The bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change request header is illustrated in Figure 20b.

to:

6.3.2.1.2.1.3 Bandwidth request and CINR report header  
Bandwidth request and CINR report PDU shall consist of bandwidth request and CINR report header alone, and shall not contain a payload (see Figure 20b)

request and CINR report header alone, and shall not contain a payload (see Figure 20b).

Change:

Figure 20b—Bandwidth request and downlink burst profile change

to:

Figure 20b—Bandwidth request and CINR report

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

The definition of DCD change indication for this table has a different meaning from what the commentor is saying. For the definition that is being referred, it is not needed, but for the actual definition, the bit is needed and useful.

The actual definition is that there was a change in state, and this bit is used to report the change in state.

#### **Group's Notes**

#### **Group's Action Items**

#### **Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

#### **Editor's Questions and Concerns**

#### **Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5021**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **18** Starting Line # **4** Fig/Table# **7a** Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.2**  
 Table does not seem to be describing UL TX Power report header.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove "CINR" and "DCD Change Indications" fields and descriptions and replace them by "UL TX Power" (size = 8 bits).  
 Also remove both notes below the table and replace them with a description of "UL-TX-Power", e.g. copied from Table 7d: "UL Tx power level in dBm, for the burst that carries this Header (11.1.1). The maximum value shall be reported for the burst"

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superseded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment 5023.](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** [1\) none needed](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5022**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 18 Starting Line # 11 Fig/Table# Section 6.3.2.1.2.1.2)  
 DVJ12(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.1.2,page=18,line=11):  
 Lines too thick.

**Suggested Remedy**

very-thin lines between rows and columns

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

very-thin lines between rows and columns

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This is a purely editorial comment. The tight schedule for this re-circ does not permit me the luxury of tweaking cosmetic changes to tables. The IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual section 5.4.3.2 (Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes) reads: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5023**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **18** Starting Line # **13** Fig/Table# Tabl Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.2**

I object to the implementation of 4011 with IEEE C802.16e-05/210r2.  
For the table 7a, wrong fields of CINR and DCD change indicator are added stead of UL Tx power.

**Suggested Remedy****6.3.2.1.2.1.2 Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report header****[Modify the table 7a as follows]**

Name	Length	Description
<del>CINR</del>	<del>7</del>	
<del>DCD-Change Indicator</del>	<del>7</del>	
<u>UL Tx power</u>	<u>8 bits</u>	<u>UL Tx power level for the burst that carries this Header (11.1.1). The maximum value shall be reported for the burst.</u>

**[Modify the text as follows at the end of the table 7a]**~~CINR~~

~~This parameter indicates the CINR measured by the MS from the BS. It shall be interpreted as a single value from -16.0 dB to 47.5 dB in unit of 0.5 dB.~~

~~DCD-Change Indication~~

~~This parameter is set to 1 if the DCD change count stored at MS is not equal to that in the received DL-MAP message. Otherwise, it is set to 0.~~

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by***[Modify page 17, lines 25-39:]*Figure 20a-Bandwidth request ~~with~~ and UL Tx power report header formatThe Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report header ~~and downlink burst profile change request header~~ shall have the following properties:

- This is a MAC signaling header type 1.
- The CID shall indicate the connection for which uplink bandwidth is requested.
- The allowed type for Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report ~~and downlink burst profile change request~~ is defined in Table 5a. The requested bandwidth is incremental.

The fields of the Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report header ~~downlink burst profile change request header~~ are defined in Table 7b.

[Modify the Table 7a, page 18, lines 21-24 as follows]

Name	Length	Description
GINR	7	
<del>DCD Change Indications</del>	4	
UL Tx power	8 bits	UL Tx power level in dBm for the burst that carries this header (as described in 11.1.1). The value shall be estimated and reported for the burst.

[Delete text on page 18, lines 33-40]

#### GINR

This parameter indicates the GINR measured by the MS from the BS. It shall be interpreted as a single value from -16.0 dB to 47.5 dB in unit of 0.5 dB.

#### DCD Change Indication

This parameter is set to 1 if the DCD change count stored at MS is not equal to that in the received DL-MAP message. Otherwise, it is set to 0.

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

[Modify page 17, lines 25-39:]

Figure 20a-Bandwidth request with and UL Tx power report header format

The Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report header ~~and downlink burst profile change request header~~ shall have the following properties:

- This is a MAC signaling header type 1.
- The CID shall indicate the connection for which uplink bandwidth is requested.
- The allowed type for Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report ~~and downlink burst profile change request~~ is defined in Table 5a. The requested bandwidth is incremental.

The fields of the Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report header ~~downlink burst profile change request header~~ are defined in Table 7b.

[Modify the Table 7a, page 18, lines 21-24 as follows]

Name	Length	Description
------	--------	-------------

GINR	7	
DGD Change Indications	4	
UL Tx power	8 bits	UL Tx power level in dBm for the burst that carries this header (as described in 11.1.1). The value shall be estimated and reported for the burst.

[Delete text on page 18, lines 33-40]

#### GINR

This parameter indicates the GINR measured by the MS from the BS. It shall be interpreted as a single value from -16.0 dB to 47.5 dB in unit of 0.5 dB.

#### DGD Change Indication

This parameter is set to 1 if the DGD change count stored at MS is not equal to that in the received DL MAP message. Otherwise, it is set to 0.

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5024**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ13(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.1.2,page=18,line=19): Why is there no description here?**

Starting Page # **18**

Starting Line # **19**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.1.2.1.2**

Suggested Remedy  
**include descriptions**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

**See comment 5023.**

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **) none needed**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5025**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **18** Starting Line # **21** Fig/Table# **7a** Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.2**

'CINR' and 'DCD Change Indications' are not fields of 'Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report' header. Therefore these fields and their descriptions are deleted from Table 7a. 'UL Tx power' for 'Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report' header should be inserted into Table 7a.

**Suggested Remedy**  
Replace line 21-24

```

" -----
CINR          | 7 |
-----
DCD Change    | 1 |
Indications   |  |
-----"

```

with

```

" -----
UL Tx Power   | 8 | UL Tx power level for the burst that carries this header
              |  | (11.1.1). The maximum value shall be reported for the
              |  | burst.
-----"

```

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution  
[See comment 5023.](#)

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [l\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5026**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Binding	Starting Page #	18ff	Starting Line #	59	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.1.4.1
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	------	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------------

The standard is not supposed to go more than 5 deep in subclauses. Even 5 deep should be avoided. 6 deep is just silly. Reorganize the subclauses so that standard doesn't have ridiculous subclause numbers like 6.3.2.3.9.11.

## Suggested Remedy

Change as indicated here and throughout the draft. It is incorrect to justify the current silliness based on the errors present in the previous standard. Resist the urge to continue making mistakes and fix them.

## Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

## Reason for Recommendation

This is an amendment draft, not a revision draft. To fix the problem we would have to restructure the base document entirely, possibly changing context, relationships, and dependencies, all of which is out-of-scope. Silly or not, we are constrained by the document we are amending. The IEEE staff obviously did not think it was *excessively* silly when they approved the 802.16-2004 document only last year. When we conduct our next revision of the standard, we can correct this problem.

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This is an amendment draft, not a revision draft. To fix the problem we would have to restructure the base document entirely, possibly changing context, relationships, and dependencies, all of which is out-of-scope. Silly or not, we are constrained by the document we are amending. The IEEE staff obviously did not think it was *excessively* silly when they approved the 802.16-2004 document only last year. When we conduct our next revision of the standard, we can correct this problem.

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

## Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5027**

Comment submitted by: **Rajesh**

**Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **19** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.2**

This section is addressing Bandwidth Request and UL TX power report header, however, the text in multiple places are describing BR and downlink burst profile change request header instead.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text below figure 20a:

" The Bandwidth request and ~~downlink burst profile change request~~ UL Tx power report header shall have the following properties"

" c) The allowed type for Bandwidth request and ~~downlink burst profile change request~~ UL Tx power report is defined in Table 5a. The requested bandwidth is incremental.

The fields of Bandwidth request and ~~downlink burst profile change request~~ UL Tx power report header are defined in Table 7~~ba~~"

Also, change Table 7a to reflect Bandwidth request and UL Tx power report header.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5023.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [1\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5028**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **020** Starting Line # **40** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.3**

There are still MSS.

**Suggested Remedy**

Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog (REG-REQ/RSP).

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog (REG-REQ/RSP).

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5029**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	021	Starting Line #	64	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.1.2.1.4
Correction									

**Suggested Remedy**

Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog (REG-REQ/RSP).

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog (REG-REQ/RSP).

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5030**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **22** Starting Line # **14** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.**

The current draft defines two mechanisms that can be used for rate adaptation: average CINR reports and preferred-DIUC reports. Both mechanisms are incomplete and lack several important definitions.

**Suggested Remedy**

Discuss and adopt contribution 802.16e-05/269 ("CINR and Preferred-MCS Reports For OFDMA PHY").

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

Adopt contribution 802.16e-05/269r1

Add MCS definition: "Modulation Coding Scheme" to the acronym section

Make the following change to the text:

If the BS instructs CINR reporting on an AAS zone ~~with AMC permutation~~, then the MS shall report the estimate of the CINR on pilot or data subcarriers that belong to slots allocated to it.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Vote: 5-5.

**Group's Notes**

Contribution 802.16e-05/269r2 was uploaded but we addressed 269r1 in the discussion.

**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** l) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5031**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **22** Starting Line # **59** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.5**  
 UL-TX-POWER clarification

**Suggested Remedy**

In section 6.3.2.1.2.1.5  
 Table 7d  
 UL-TX-POWER field  
 Change "dBm"  
 To "dBm per subcarrier"

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Table 7d-PHY channel report header fields  
 UL Tx power level in dBm; for the burst that carries this hHeader (11.1.1).  
 The ~~maximum~~ value ~~is~~ shall be estimated and reported for the burst.

## 11.1.1 Current transmit power

The average transmitted power used for the burst which carried the message. The parameter is reported in dBm and is quantized in 0.5 dBm steps ranging from ~~-68~~4 dBm (encoded 0x00) to ~~64~~3.5 dBm (encoded 0xFF). Values outside this range shall be assigned the closest extreme. The parameter is only applicable to systems supporting the SCa, OFDM, or OFDMA PHY ~~specifications~~. specifications. However, for the OFDM or OFDMA PHY, this value indicates the average transmitted power of each subcarrier for the burst which carried the message.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Table 7d-PHY channel report header fields  
 UL Tx power level in dBm; for the burst that carries this hHeader (11.1.1).  
 The ~~maximum~~ value ~~is~~ shall be estimated and reported for the burst.

## 11.1.1 Current transmit power

The average transmitted power used for the burst which carried the message. The parameter is reported in dBm and is quantized in 0.5 dBm steps ranging from ~~-68~~4 dBm (encoded 0x00) to ~~64~~3.5 dBm (encoded 0xFF). Values outside this range shall be assigned the closest extreme. The parameter is only applicable to systems supporting the SCa, OFDM, or OFDMA PHY ~~specifications~~. specifications. However, for the OFDM or OFDMA PHY, this value indicates the average transmitted power of each subcarrier for the burst which carried the message.

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

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5032**

Comment submitted by: [Beomjoon](#)

[Kim](#)

[Other](#)

[2005/06/08](#)

Comment Type [Technical, Non-binding](#)

Starting Page # [024](#)

Starting Line # [42](#)

Fig/Table#

Section

[6.3.2.1.2.1.6](#)

[Correction](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog \(REG-REQ/RSP\).](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog \(REG-REQ/RSP\).](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5033**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type <b>Technical, Non-binding</b>	Starting Page # <b>024</b>	Starting Line # <b>42</b>	Fig/Table#	Section <b>6.3.2.1.2.1.6</b>
<b>Correction</b>					

**Suggested Remedy**

Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog (REG-REQ/RSP).

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog (REG-REQ/RSP).

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** 1) none needed

Seems to be an exact duplicate of comment #5032

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5034**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **25** Starting Line # **40** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.7**  
 Name "RqstID" [Request ID"?) of the field indicating whether the SN Report header is the last header is misleading

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "RqstID" to "Last" throughout the document

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified Recommendation by***[In 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 SN report header, page 25, Figure 20f, replace 'RqstID' with 'Last' in the figure:]**[In 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 SN report header, page 25, Figure 20f, replace 'SDU SN MSB (4)' with 'SDU SN 2 MSB (4)' in the figure:]**[In 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 SN report header, page 25, line 41, modify as:]*e) The ~~RqstID~~**Last** field may be used to indicate whether the SN Report header is the last header, thus accommodating up to 6 active connections.*[In 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 SN report header, page 26, Table 7f, replace 'RqstID' with 'Last' in the table:]***Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified***[In 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 SN report header, page 25, Figure 20f, replace 'RqstID' with 'Last' in the figure:]**[In 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 SN report header, page 25, Figure 20f, replace 'SDU SN MSB (4)' with 'SDU SN 2 MSB (4)' in the figure:]**[In 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 SN report header, page 25, line 41, modify as:]*e) The ~~RqstID~~**Last** field may be used to indicate whether the SN Report header is the last header, thus accommodating up to 6 active connections.*[In 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 SN report header, page 26, Table 7f, replace 'RqstID' with 'Last' in the table:]***Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5035**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	26	Starting Line #	15	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.1.2.1.7
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

There is only one CID in this header: Basic CID which has no relation to SN feature

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the first CID in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the second CID in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the third CID in this header.

to

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the first Service Flow addressed in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the second Service Flow addressed in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the third Service Flow addressed in this header

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

Change

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the first CID in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the second CID in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the third CID in this header.

to

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the first Service Flow addressed in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the second Service Flow addressed in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the third Service Flow addressed in this header

Change the reference to 6.3.20.2.6.2.3 to be 6.3.21.3.5.1.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Change

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the first CID in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the second CID in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the third CID in this header.

to

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the first Service Flow addressed in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the second Service Flow addressed in this header.

The ARQ BSN (LSB) or MAC SDU SN (LSB) for the third Service Flow addressed in this header

Change the reference to 6.3.20.2.6.2.3 to be 6.3.21.3.5.1.

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

Remember to use a cross reference as another comment proposes a change to the new subclause number.

#### Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Used a cross reference.

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review:	<b>P802.16e/D8</b>	Ballot Number:	<b>0001045</b>	Comment Date
Comment #	<b>5036</b>	Comment submitted by:	Mark Cudak	Member
				2005/06/08
Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#
	Editorial	26	19	
				Section
				6.3.2.1.2.3

This section describes a header of Type II, so should be renumbered to 6.3.2.1.2.2.1.

Consequently, section 6.3.2.1.2.3.1 (MIMO channel feedback header) should be renumbered to 6.3.2.1.2.2.1.1

#### Suggested Remedy

Change Section number of 6.3.2.1.2.3 to 6.3.2.1.2.2.1

Change Section number of 6.3.2.1.2.3.1 to 6.3.2.1.2.2.1.1

Proposed Resolution                      Recommendation:                                      Recommendation by

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group                                      Decision of Group: **Superseded**

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

See comment 5048.

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    l) none needed

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5037**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **026** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.7**  
Correction

**Suggested Remedy**

Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog (REG-REQ/RSP).

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Support of this subheader shall be negotiated between the BS and ~~MSS~~ MS as part of the registration dialog (REG-REQ/RSP).

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5038**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	26	Starting Line #	38	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.1.2.2
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

First of all, "Table 5a7g" should be "Table 7g".  
 Secondly, Figure 20g should show the Type field.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"Table **5a7g**"

Change Figure 20g as follows:

Create 1-bit sized box following the EC box with text "Type (1)". Decrease the size of the "Header Content MSB (14)" accordingly and change its text to "Header Content MSB (13)".

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Change text as follows:

"Table **5a7g**"

Change Figure 20g as follows:

Create 1-bit sized box following the EC box with text "Type (1)". Decrease the size of the "Header Content MSB (14)" accordingly and change its text to "Header Content MSB (13)".

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"Table **5a7g**"

Change Figure 20g as follows:

Create 1-bit sized box following the EC box with text "Type (1)". Decrease the size of the "Header Content MSB (14)" accordingly and change its text to "Header Content MSB (13)".

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5039**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**  
**Correction**

Starting Page # **026**

Starting Line # **38**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.1.2.2**

Suggested Remedy  
**Table 5a7g**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution  
**See comment 5038.**

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **) none needed**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5040**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **26** Starting Line # **45** Fig/Table# **20g** Section **6.3.2.1.2.2**

The MAC singaling header Type II is well defined, however the "Type" field is missing from figure 20g.

**Suggested Remedy**

Specific changes in the standard:

**[Change in section 6.3.2.1.2.2]**Table **5a7g** describes the encoding of the 1-bit field...

[Change in Table 20g:]

Add the field "Type (1)" after EC=1 (1)

Change "Header Content MSB" from **14** --> **13****Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**[See comment 5038.](#)**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed[Appears as though the Group Decision was supposed to be "Superceded".](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5041**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ14(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.2,page=27,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **27** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Type field

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Center the column under header: Type field

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5042**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ15(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.2,page=27,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **27** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Reference Figure

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Center the column under header: Reference Figure

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5043**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ16(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.2,page=27,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **27** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Reference Table

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Center the column under header: Reference Table

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5044**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	Starting Page #	<b>27</b>	Starting Line #	<b>8</b>	Fig/Table#	Section	<b>6.3.2.1.2.2</b>
---------	------	----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------	-----------------	----------	------------	---------	--------------------

DVJ17(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.2,page=27,line=8):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Reference  
Figure  
==>  
Reference  
figure

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: **Accepted****

Reference  
Figure  
==>  
Reference  
figure

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5045**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>6.3.2.1.2.2</b>

DVJ18(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.2,page=27,line=8):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Reference  
Table  
==>  
Reference  
table

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reference  
Table  
==>  
Reference  
table

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5046**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	27	Starting Line #	8	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.1.2.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-------------

DVJ19(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.2,page=27,line=8):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Type field

==>

Type field

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Type field

==>

Type field

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5047**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **27** Starting Line # **12** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.2**  
 DVJ20(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.2,page=27,line=12):  
 Are these cells intentionally blank?

**Suggested Remedy**

Use an en or em dash in intentionally blank cells.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Use an en or em dash in intentionally blank cells.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

I know that some of such changes are already done in the document in previous versions, but it breaks editorial competability with previous versions of 802.16 ans specifically the baseline. The baseline of 802.16-2004 and previous version passes through the IEEE editors prior to publishment and blanks were left as blanks, and YES they were intentionally left blank and not by accident.  
 We will fix the "Dashes" mistake prior to publishing of this document

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5048**Comment submitted by: **Rajesh****Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **27** Starting Line # **19** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2..3**  
 Incorrect section numbers

**Suggested Remedy**

Change section number 6.3.2.1.2.3 to **6.3.2.1.2.2.1**;  
 Change section number 6.3.2.1.2.3.1 to **6.3.2.1.2.2.1.1**;

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

*[In 6.3.2.1.2.3 Feedback header, page 28, Figure 20i, replace 'EC (1)' with 'EC=1 (1)' in the figure:]*  
 In Figure 20j, Change: HT = 0 (1) to HT = 1(1)  
 in Figure 20k, change EC (1) to EC = 1(1)  
 Change section number 6.3.2.1.2.3 to **6.3.2.1.2.2.1**;  
 Change section number 6.3.2.1.2.3.1 to **6.3.2.1.2.2.1.1**;

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

*[In 6.3.2.1.2.3 Feedback header, page 28, Figure 20i, replace 'EC (1)' with 'EC=1 (1)' in the figure:]*  
 In Figure 20j, Change: HT = 0 (1) to HT = 1(1)  
 in Figure 20k, change EC (1) to EC = 1(1)  
 Change section number 6.3.2.1.2.3 to **6.3.2.1.2.2.1**;  
 Change section number 6.3.2.1.2.3.1 to **6.3.2.1.2.2.1.1**;

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5049**

Comment submitted by: Tal

Kaitz

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **27** Starting Line # **23**  
reference in 6.3.2.1.2.3 should be to 6.3.2.2.7.3 and not to 6.3.2.2.7.4

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.3**

**Suggested Remedy**

change reference on page 27, line 23, from 6.3.2.2.7.4 to 6.3.2.2.7.3.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

change reference on page 27, line 23, from 6.3.2.2.7.4 to 6.3.2.2.7.3.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5050**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **27** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section

Expression "UL resource" appears many times in the text without no definition of such term. Seems more clear to change the language [rather than to invent a definition of the resource]

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the language: for each appearance of "allocate UL resource" change it to "provide UL allocation"

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified Recommendation by**

*[In 8.4.5.4.29 Feedback polling IE, page 377, Table 302x, line 30, under 'Notes', modify as:]*

'0: No dedicated UL resource is allocated in feedback polling IE. BS shall ~~allocate~~provide UL ~~resource~~allocation for the Feedback header transmission at each designated transmitting frame defined by this IE  
1: Dedicated UL resource is included'

*[In 8.4.5.4.29 Feedback polling IE, page 378, line 39, modify as:]*

**Dedicated UL Allocation**

'0: No dedicated UL resource is allocated in feedback polling IE. BS shall ~~allocate~~provide UL ~~resource~~allocation for the Feedback header transmission at each designated transmitting frame defined by this IE  
1: Dedicated UL resource is included'

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*[In 8.4.5.4.29 Feedback polling IE, page 377, Table 302x, line 30, under 'Notes', modify as:]*

'0: No dedicated UL resource is allocated in feedback polling IE. BS shall ~~allocate~~provide UL ~~resource~~allocation for the Feedback header transmission at each designated transmitting frame defined by this IE  
1: Dedicated UL resource is included'

*[In 8.4.5.4.29 Feedback polling IE, page 378, line 39, modify as:]*

**Dedicated UL Allocation**

'0: No dedicated UL resource is allocated in feedback polling IE. BS shall ~~allocate~~provide UL ~~resource~~allocation for the Feedback header transmission at each designated transmitting frame defined by this IE  
1: Dedicated UL resource is included'

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**



Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**      Ballot Number: **0001045**      Comment Date

Comment # **5051**      Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon Kim**      Other      2005/06/08

Comment      Type **Editorial**      Starting Page # **028**      Starting Line # **35**      Fig/Table# **20i**      Section **6.3.2.1.2.3**  
[Correction](#)

Suggested Remedy

[EC=1](#) (1)

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation:      Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group      Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[EC=1](#) (1)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5052**Comment submitted by: **Mo-Han****Fong**

Member

2005/06/08

**Comment**      **Type** **Technical, Non-binding**      **Starting Page #** **29**      **Starting Line #** **7**      **Fig/Table#**      **Section** **6.3.2.1.2.3**

I object to the resolution of comment #4011, because the TLVs regarding supporting various MAC header/subheader in REG-REQ/RSP message needs to be clean up.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the proposed text change in contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/291.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Adopt the proposed text change in contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/291.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5053**Comment submitted by: **Rajesh****Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **30** Starting Line # **29** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.3**

Feedback type 0011 reports Preferred DIUC index from the MS. However, there is not indication of which DCD the preferred DIUC is associated to.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add DCD change count to feedback content. Change line 29 to:  
" Preferred-DIUC (4 bits) + [DCD change count \(4 bits\)](#) "

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Add DCD change count to feedback content. Change line 29 to:  
" Preferred-DIUC (4 bits) + [DCD change count \(4 bits\)](#) "

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted**

Add DCD change count to feedback content. Change line 29 to:  
" Preferred-DIUC (4 bits) + [DCD change count \(4 bits\)](#) "

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5054**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **31**

Starting Line # **7**

Fig/Table# **7i**

Section **6.3.2.1.2.3**

'UL-TX-POWER (7bits)' should consist with 'current transmit power' in section 11.1.1

**Suggested Remedy**

Change UL-TX-POWER (7bits) with UL TX-POWER (8bits).

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change UL-TX-POWER (7bits) with UL TX-POWER (8bits).

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5055**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ21(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.3,page=31,line=51): Line too dark	Editorial, Satisfied (was	31	51		6.3.2.1.2.3

**Suggested Remedy**

Use very thin line between rows.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Use very thin line between rows.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This is a purely editorial comment. The tight schedule for this re-circ does not permit me the luxury of tweaking cosmetic changes to tables. The IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual section 5.4.3.2 (Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes) reads: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5056**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**  
**Correction**

Starting Page # **32**

Starting Line # **16**

Fig/Table# **20j**

Section **6.3.2.1.2.3.1**

Suggested Remedy

**HT=θ<sub>1</sub> (1)**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**HT=θ<sub>1</sub> (1)**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5057**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ22(subclause=6.3.2.1.2.3.1,page=32,line=55): Missing period.**

Starting Page # **32**

Starting Line # **55**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.1.2.3.1**

Suggested Remedy  
[add a period](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[add a period](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [c\) instructions unclear](#)

[Couldn't find where one is required.](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5058**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **35** Starting Line # **9** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.2**)  
 I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: The instance of 'SS' in the first line is suspect. Unless also reflected in the D3 Corrigenda draft (which it is not), use of 'SS' in this instance would break backwards compatibility with an 802.16-2004 compliant SS in any number of ways, violate the 16e PAR: original 802.16-2004 compliant SS would 1) encode the message using the previous, 2 byte length and format specified in the 802.16-2004 standard, 2) would absolutely fail to properly encode the new message with its changed three byte length message and radically altered format including new conditional loop and new message information elements. Usage of 'SS' in this instance would create a retroactive requirement that is unsupportable. Clearly this feature was intended as an enhancement for MS, but was inappropriately, retroactively applied.

This problem is not easily overcome since the subheader is created by the SS (or MS), not the BS. So legacy SS currently create 2 byte Grant Management subheaders; not the 3 byte subheaders the new language specifies. The correct solution is to leave the original Grant Management Subheader alone and add a new Extended Subheader: Mobility Grant Management Extended Subheader.

**Suggested Remedy**

Accept Contribution C802.16e-05/272r0

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

Remove the paragraph spanning lines 14-20 on page 35.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Remove the paragraph spanning lines 14-20 on page 35.



Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5059**

Comment submitted by: Rajesh

Bhalla

Member

2005/06/08

Comment            Type **Technical, Binding**                      Starting Page # **35**            Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table#            Section **6.3.2.2.2**

The grant mangement subheader is still only two bytes long, why was the description changed?

Suggested Remedy

Change the following text:

" The Grant Management subheader is ~~two~~ three-two bytes in length"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5058.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5060**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **35** Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.2**

Grant management sub-header is 2-byte length sub-header.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change 'three bytes' with 'two bytes'.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

See comment 5058.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions 1) none needed

Appears as though the Group Decision was supposed to be "Superceded".

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5061**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**  
**Correction**

Starting Page # **035**

Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.2.2.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

The Grant Management subheader is two ~~three~~ bytes in length and ...

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superseded****

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

**See comment 5058.**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5062**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **35** Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.2**

Based on Table 9, the grant Management subheader is still 2-byte long, not 3 bytes.

**Suggested Remedy**

change "three" back to "two".

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superseded****

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

See comment 5058.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5063**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **36** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# **10** Section

"Frame Latency" appears several times in the table. What does this expression mean?

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "Frame Latency" to "Latency", "FLI" to "LI", "FL" to "L" or "Latency"

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

The Frame Latency is used to indicate the latency measured in unit of frames. It is more specific than just Latency.

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

The Frame Latency is used to indicate the latency measured in unit of frames. It is more specific than just Latency.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5064**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **36**

Starting Line # **27**

Fig/Table# **table**

Section **6.3.2.2.2**

the reserved bits is 9, not 8, based on Table 9.

Suggested Remedy

change 8 to 9.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

change 8 to 9.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5065**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	36	Starting Line #	29	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.2.7
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ23(subclause=6.3.2.2.7,page=36,line=29):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Format

==>

format

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Format

==>

format

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5066**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **36** Starting Line # **31** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7**

DVJ24(subclause=6.3.2.2.7,page=36,line=31):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Field  
==>  
field

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Field  
==>  
field

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5067**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 36 Starting Line # 33 Fig/Table# Section 6.3.2.2.7

Section 6.3.2.2.7 gives the impression that a packet can have multiple ESF subheaders (e.g. line 39/40 on page 36, description on line 13 on page 37). However, if Figure 21 is valid, then there is no way to indicate more than one type in a 'subheader group'. This means that it is impossible to include more than 1 subheader in a packet.

One possible solution is to change Figure 21, so that it contains only two fields: the "extended subheader lengths" field and the "subheader body" field. The "Rsv" and "extended subheader type" fields should then be included in all extended subheaders, i.e. in Table 13c, Table 13d, Table 13e, Table 13f, Table 13g and Table 13h.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change Figure 21, so that it contains only two fields: the "extended subheader lengths" field and the "subheader body" field (i.e. effectively remove the "Rsv" and "extended subheader type" fields).

Include the "Rsv" and "extended subheader type" fields at the beginning of Table 13c, Table 13d, Table 13e, Table 13f, Table 13g and Table 13h.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

Adopt contribution C80216e-05\_282.

[Change the text as indicated:]

6.3.2.2.7 Extended ~~S~~subheader group ~~F~~format

~~The Extended Subheader format is specified in Table 13a. The Extended Ssubheader group (see Figure 21). Field, when used, shall always appear immediately after the Generic MACæ Header and before all other subheaders, and PN number (if MAC PDU is protected (i.e., when EC=1)), as described in 6.3.2.2. The Extended Subheader format is specified in Tables 13a and 13b. All eExtended subheaders shall not be encrypted, but shall be protected by the payload CRC field. The ESF and all extended subheaders associated to it are transmitted sequentially.~~

[Replace Table 13b with the following, add new Table 13c]

-----  
Table 13b - Description of Extended subheaders (DL)

ESF Type	Name	Length (bytes)	Description
0	SDU_SN extended subheader	1	See 6.3.2.2.7.1
1	DL Sleep control extended subheader	3	See 6.3.2.2.7.2
2	Feedback request extended subheader	3	See 6.3.2.2.7.3
3	SN request extended subheader	4	See 6.3.2.2.7.7
4 -127	Reserved		

-----  
Table 13c - Description of Extended subheaders (UL)

ESF Type	Name	Length (bytes)	Description
0	MIMO mode feedback extended subheader	1	See 6.3.2.2.7.4
1	UL Tx power report extended subheader	1	See 6.3.2.2.7.5
2	Mini-Feedback extended subheader	2	See 6.3.2.2.7.6
3 -127	Reserved		

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Adopt contribution C80216e-05\_282.

[Change the text as indicated:]

**6.3.2.2.7 Extended Ssubheader group Fformat**

~~The Extended Subheader format is specified in Table 13a. The Extended Ssubheader group (see Figure 21). Field, when used, shall always appear immediately after the Generic MACæ Header and before all other subheaders, and PN number (if MAC PDU is protected (i.e., when EC=1)), as described in 6.3.2.2. The Extended Subheader format is specified in Tables 13a and 13b. All eExtended subheaders shall not be encrypted., but shall be protected by the payload CRC field. The ESF and all extended subheaders associated to it are transmitted sequentially.~~

[Replace Table 13b with the following, add new Table 13c]

-----  
Table 13b - Description of Extended subheader types (DL)

ES Type	Name	Extended subheader body size (bytes)	Description
0	SDU_SN extended subheader	1	See 6.3.2.2.7.1
1	DL Sleep control extended subheader	3	See 6.3.2.2.7.2
2	Feedback request extended subheader	3	See 6.3.2.2.7.3
3	SN request extended subheader	1	See 6.3.2.2.7.7
4 -127	Reserved		

-----  
Table 13c - Description of Extended subheader types (UL)

ES Type	Name	Extended subheader body size (bytes)	Description
0	MIMO mode feedback extended subheader	1	See 6.3.2.2.7.4
1	UL Tx power report extended subheader	1	See 6.3.2.2.7.5
2	Mini-Feedback extended subheader	2	See 6.3.2.2.7.6
3 -127	Reserved		

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

Changed figure number from 21 to 20l (new figure should be inserted "between" existing figures in baseline standard and).

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5068**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **36**

Starting Line # **38**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.2.7**

CRC is not mandatory.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows: "shall be protected by the payload CRC field, if such a field exists."

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superseded****

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

[See comment 5067](#)

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5069**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **36** Starting Line # **51** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7**

Figure 21, the Rsv field is only one bit, but showing 8-bit long. Also, the bit mark in the entire Figure 21 is incorrect.

**Suggested Remedy**

see contribution C80216e-05\_282 for a re-drawing of Figure 21.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Adopt contribution C80216e-05\_282.

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

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

See comment 5067

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5070**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **36** Starting Line # **54** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7**

DVJ25(subclause=6.3.2.2.7,page=36,line=54):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Format  
==>  
format

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Format  
==>  
format

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5071**Comment submitted by: **Rajesh****Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **editorial** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line #  
 Table 13b Description of extended subheaders need to be clarified

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7**

**Suggested Remedy**

Change Table 13b according to the following:

1. Change "ESF Bit" to "ES Type"
2. Change "Bits #6-127" to "6"
3. Separate this table to DL and UL table as according to the description in the section

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superseded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment 5067](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5072**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **13** Fig/Table# **13a** Section

Language clarification: there is no "group"

Suggested Remedy

Change

The Extended Subheader Group Length field indicates the length of the subheader group, including all the subheader, and including this length byte

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 5067.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions  none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5073**Comment submitted by: **Lei****Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **20** Fig/Table# **Tabl** Section **6.3.2.2.7**  
clarification to the extended subheader body field.

**Suggested Remedy**

in the description box of "Extended subheader body" of Table 13a, i.e., line 20 page 37, change the text to:

As defined in Table 13b. The size of the extended subheader body is byte aligned.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Type of subheader as defined in Tables 13b and 13c.

As defined in Tables 13b and 13c. The size of the extended subheader body is byte aligned.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

In the Table 13a, modify the text as indicated:

Type of subheader as defined in Tables 13b and 13c.

Following the table, modify the paragraph as indicated:

As defined in Tables 13b and 13c. The size of the extended subheader body is byte aligned.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions **k) done****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5074**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **24**Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7**

DL and UL extended subheaders are both included in Table 13b.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as indicated below:

"is given for both DL and UL in Table 13b ~~for the DL and in Table 13c for the UL.~~"**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comments 5073, 5067.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** ) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5075**Comment submitted by: **Mo-Han****Fong**

Member

2005/06/08

**Comment**      **Type** **Technical, Non-binding**      **Starting Page #** **37**      **Starting Line #** **31**      **Fig/Table#**      **Section** **6.3.2.2.7**

I object to the text change in D8 regarding the MS-assisted coordination of DL transmission during FBSS and HO because there needs to be a mean for the BS to explicitly request the MS to send the SN report header in case the original header transmission is lost.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the proposed text change in contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/296.

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**      **Recommendation by**

Adopt the proposed text change in contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/296r1.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Adopt the proposed text change in contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/296r1.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5076**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	37	Starting Line #	47	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.2.7.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------------

DVJ26(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.1,page=37,line=47):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended Subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended Subheader  
==>  
extender

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5077**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **49** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7.1**

DVJ27(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.1,page=37,line=49):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended  
==>  
extended

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended  
==>  
extended

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5078**

Comment submitted by: **Vladimir**

**Yanover**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type <b>Editorial</b>	Starting Page # <b>37</b>	Starting Line # <b>49</b>	Fig/Table#	Section
Typo					

Suggested Remedy  
Change

Bits #6-127

to

Bits #6-7

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation:      Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group      Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5067.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    [1\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5079**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **50** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7.1**

DVJ28(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.1,page=37,line=50):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended  
==>  
extended

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended  
==>  
extended

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5080**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **51** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7.1**

DVJ29(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.1,page=37,line=51):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended  
==>  
extended

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended  
==>  
extended

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5081**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ31(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.2,page=38,line=21): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	38	21		6.3.2.2.7.2

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended

==&gt;

extended

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended

==&gt;

extended

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5082**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **38** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7.2**

DVJ30(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.2,page=38,line=28):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended  
==>  
extended

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended  
==>  
extended

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5083**

Comment submitted by: **Vladimir**

**Yanover**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type <b>Editorial</b>	Starting Page # <b>38</b>	Starting Line # <b>38</b>	Fig/Table#	Section
Typo					

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "Power\_Saving\_Class" to "Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change "Power\_Saving\_Class" to "Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5084**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	38	49		6.3.2.2.7.3

DVJ32(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.3,page=38,line=49):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Request Extended  
==>  
request extended

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Request Extended  
==>  
request extended

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5085**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	38	Starting Line #	52	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.2.7.3
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------------

DVJ33(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.3,page=38,line=52):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended Subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended Subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5086**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **39** Starting Line # **38** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7.4**  
 DVJ34(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.4,page=39,line=38):  
 Table columns containing single word, numbers, or  
 sentence fragments should be centered.

**Suggested Remedy**Center the column under header: Length  
(bits)**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**Center the column under header: Length  
(bits)**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5087**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	40	Starting Line #	2	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.2.7.5
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-------------

DVJ35(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.5,page=40,line=2):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**  
Extended Subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended Subheader  
==>  
extender

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5088**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ41(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.5,page=40,line=5):**  
**Need a period.**

Starting Page # **40**

Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.2.7.5**

Suggested Remedy

**Use a period.**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**Use a period.**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **1) none needed**

**Fixed by another comment. What was actually needed here was the removal of an extra linefeed.**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5089**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>7</b>		<b>6.3.2.2.7.5</b>

DVJ36(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.5,page=40,line=7):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5090**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ40(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.5,page=40,line=7): Inconsistent capitalization.**

Starting Page # **40**

Starting Line # **7**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.2.7.5**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Tx Power Report throughout**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

**Tx Power Report throughout**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5091**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **40** Starting Line # **12** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7.5**

DVJ37(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.5,page=40,line=12):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Extended subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5092**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **40**

Starting Line # **13**

Fig/Table# **13g**

Section **6.3.2.2.7.5**

UL Tx power is based on 'current transmit power' in section 11.1.1.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change table 13g as follows:

Name	Size (bits)	Description
UL Tx Power	8	UL Tx power level for the burst that carries this header (11.1.1). The maximum value shall be reported for the burst.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5094](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5093**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ43(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.5,page=40,line=15): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

Starting Page # **40**

Starting Line # **15**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.2.7.5**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Size (bits)

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Size (bits)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5094**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **40** Starting Line # **18** Fig/Table# Section

I object to the implementation of 4040 with IEEE C802.16e-05/236r1.  
For the table 13g, reserved field shall be removed as accepted in 4040.

**Suggested Remedy**

6.3.2.2.7.5 UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader  
[Table 13g- UL Tx power report extended subheader format](#)

Name	Length	Description
UL Tx power	<del>78</del>	UL Tx power level for the burst that carries this Header (11.1.1). The maximum value shall be reported for the burst.
<b>Reserved</b>	<b>4</b>	

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted** Recommendation by

6.3.2.2.7.5 UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader  
[Table 13g- UL Tx power report extended subheader format](#)

Name	Length	Description
UL Tx power	<del>78</del>	UL Tx power level for the burst that carries this Header (11.1.1). The maximum value shall be reported for the burst.
<b>Reserved</b>	<b>4</b>	

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

6.3.2.2.7.5 UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader  
[Table 13g- UL Tx power report extended subheader format](#)

Name	Length	Description
UL Tx power	<del>78</del>	UL Tx power level for the burst that carries this header (11.1.1). The <del>maximum</del> value shall be estimated and reported for the burst.

Reserved

4

---

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5095**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **40** Starting Line # **25** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.2.7.6**

DVJ38(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.6,page=40,line=25):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5096**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>27</b>		<b>6.3.2.2.7.6</b>

DVJ39(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.6,page=40,line=27):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: **Accepted****

Extended subheader  
==>  
extended subheader

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5097**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	40	Starting Line #	32	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.2.7.6
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------------

DVJ42(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.6,page=40,line=32):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Extended subheaders  
==>  
extended subheaders

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Extended subheaders  
==>  
extended subheaders

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5098**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ44(subclause=6.3.2.2.7.6,page=40,line=35): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

Starting Page # **40**

Starting Line # **35**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.2.7.6**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Size (bits)

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Size (bits)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5099**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment      Type **Technical, Non-binding**      Starting Page # **42**      Starting Line # **57**      Fig/Table# **14**      Section **6.3.2.3**

According to 802.16-2004, Section 6.3.2.3 "MAC Management messages on the Basic, Broadcast, and Initial Ranging connections shall neither be fragmented nor packed. MAC Management messages on the Primary Management Connection may be packed and/or fragmented". The length of mobility management messages is variable and there is a good possibility that some will need to be fragmented for transmission over the radio link. However, these messages are currently marked for transmission over the Basic connection and, therefore, cannot be fragmented. They should be transmitted over the Primary Management connection.

**Suggested Remedy**

In Table 14, change the following from "basic" connection to "Primary Management" connection:

- Type 56, MOB\_BSHO-REQ, "BS HO Request message".
- Type 57, MOB\_MSHO-REQ, "MS HO Request message".
- Type 58, MOB\_BSHO-RSP, "BS HO Response message".
- Type 59, MOB\_HO-IND, "HO Indication message".

and change the introductory text in the corresponding sub-sections of §6.3.2.3 to read: "This message shall be transmitted on the basic primary management CID"

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

While the intention of the commentor is understood, basic connection is used to carry "delay -intolerant" MAC management messages while primary connection is used to carry "delay-tolerant" MAC management messages. This translates to different priority at scheduling time. HO messages are all very critical for the survival of MS in a network, they should not be transported over a "delay tolerant" connection.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5100**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	43	Starting Line #	11	Fig/Table#	Section
typo								

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "MBAS MAP message" to "MBS MAP message"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change "MBAS MAP message" to "MBS MAP message"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5101**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	43	Starting Line #	27	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: The PKM sentence added after Table 14 could unintentionally allow a 16e compliant BS to send a PKM-RSP on a Broadcast CID, for which the stateful, 802.16-2004 compliant SS would not be expecting and would ignore. At least, it does not appropriately prohibit the error, though a properly designed BS should be able to make the distinction between target SS and MS and restrict transmission to the appropriate connection ID type. But a minor change in the sentence eliminates any ambiguity in the inadequate specification.

**Suggested Remedy***[In 6.3.2.3 MAC Management messages, page 43, line 27, modify as:]*

'In general, the PKM-RSP message is carried on the Primary Management connection. However, in order to send the PKM-RSP message in key push mode to MS for ~~the~~ multicast service or ~~the~~ broadcast service, it may be carried on the Broadcast connection.'

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by***[In 6.3.2.3 MAC Management messages, page 43, line 27, modify as:]*

'In general, the PKM-RSP message is carried on the Primary Management connection. However, in order to send the PKM-RSP message in key push mode to MS for ~~the~~ multicast service or ~~the~~ broadcast service, it may be carried on the Broadcast connection.'

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted***[In 6.3.2.3 MAC Management messages, page 43, line 27, modify as:]*

'In general, the PKM-RSP message is carried on the Primary Management connection. However, in order to send the PKM-RSP message in key push mode to MS for ~~the~~ multicast service or ~~the~~ broadcast service, it may be carried on the Broadcast connection.'

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5102**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	43	Starting Line #	63	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.5
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarassment to the membership.

Problem: Striking of the first line seems to break backwards compatibility as it removes 'SS' specification of which CID to present in the MAC header during any initial ranging prior to assignment of Basic CID. An 802.16-2004 compliant SS would intend to use the proscribed initial ranging CID, while this amendment would retroactively remove that specification. No such clarification was found in the D3 Corrigenda. The proposed change is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and needs to be fixed.

The simplest remedy would be to leave the current a), b), c) options of the 802.16-2004 specification alone. Any change here is unnecessary since an MS is always also an SS and would be governed under the specification in the section, which would seem to achieve the same thing.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[Delete page 43, line 63 through page 44, line 8, including the editorial instructions]*

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[Delete page 43, line 63 through page 44, line 8, including the editorial instructions]*

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[Delete page 43, line 63 through page 44, line 8, including the editorial instructions]*

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5103**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	44	Starting Line #	12	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------

Clarification. At this moment MS does not have any CID allocated

**Suggested Remedy**

21. 44/12 All other parameters are coded as TLV tuples as defined in 11.5. TLV message elements shall only be included in RNG-REQ messages of adequate UL bandwidth. If required TLV message elements cannot be accommodated in the UL bandwidth of a current RNG-REQ message, the MS shall make UL BW request of sufficient size for CID = 0 to conduct additional RNG-REQ including all required message

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation: Accepted-Modified</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	--	--------------------------

Change the paragraph on page 44, lines 12-17 to read as follows:

All other parameters are coded as TLV tuples as defined in 11.5. TLV message elements shall only be included in RNG-REQ messages of adequate UL bandwidth. BS shall provide for initial RNG-REQ message allocation of size sufficient for transmission of RNG-REQ message with no TLVs and bandwidth request header.

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified</b>
----------------------------	---

Change the paragraph on page 44, lines 12-17 to read as follows:

All other parameters are coded as TLV tuples as defined in 11.5. TLV message elements shall only be included in RNG-REQ messages of adequate UL bandwidth. BS shall provide for initial RNG-REQ message allocation of size sufficient for transmission of RNG-REQ message with no TLVs and bandwidth request header.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

<b>Editor's Notes</b>	<b>Editor's Actions</b> k) done
-----------------------	---------------------------------

I think that there is a slight ambiguity in the new sentence:

"BS shall provide for initial RNG-REQ message allocation of size sufficient for transmission of RNG-REQ message with no TLVs and bandwidth request header."

It is not clear whether bandwidth request header is allowed or not, better phrasing would have been:

"BS shall provide for initial RNG-REQ message allocation of size sufficient for transmission of bandwidth request header or RNG-REQ message with no TLVs."

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5104**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **44** Starting Line # **19** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.5**

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: A problem with incorrect change of SS to MS for existing text on page 44, line 19 in the 16e/D8 document; page 49, sixth paragraph in the section of 802.16-2004. Change to MS from SS would remove necessary specification in the 802.16-2004 document breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR. This MUST be fixed.

Changing this back to 'SS' from 'MS' does not hurt us in any way since an MS is always an SS unless otherwise specified.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[In 6.3.2.3.5 Ranging Request (RNG\_REQ) message, page 44, line 19, modify as; note that this returns the line to the original text:]*

'The following parameters shall be included in the RNG-REQ message when the ~~M~~SS is attempting to join the network:'

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[In 6.3.2.3.5 Ranging Request (RNG\_REQ) message, page 44, line 19, modify as; note that this returns the line to the original text:]*

'The following parameters shall be included in the RNG-REQ message when the ~~M~~SS is attempting to join the network:'

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[In 6.3.2.3.5 Ranging Request (RNG\_REQ) message, page 44, line 19, modify as; note that this returns the line to the original text:]*

'The following parameters shall be included in the RNG-REQ message when the ~~M~~SS is attempting to join the network:'

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

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5105**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	44	Starting Line #	32	Fig/Table#	Section
Language correction								

Suggested Remedy  
Change:

The serving BSID shall not be included if the **aging interval** timer is timed-out

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation: **Accepted**      Recommendation by  
Change:

The serving BSID shall not be included if the **aging interval** timer is timed-out

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group      Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
Change:

The serving BSID shall not be included if the **aging interval** timer is timed-out

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5106**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	44	Starting Line #	38	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.5
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

The "MS Previous IP Address" TLV is currently defined for use in a REG-REQ message (§11.7.15) but a REG-REQ is not always required on re-entry and, if it is sent, the REG-REQ is too late in the re-entry sequence to be of any use. It should accompany the "Serving BSID" in a RNG-REQ message sent when an MS is attempting to perform re-entry, association or handover.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert the following text - "**MS Previous IP Address**. The MS Previous IP Address specifies the IP address that was assigned to the MS by a previous Serving BS".

Also change "Scope" for TLV definition in §11.7.15 on page 521.

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Insert the following text - "**MS Previous IP Address**. The MS Previous IP Address specifies the IP address that was assigned to the MS by a previous Serving BS".

Also change "Scope" for TLV definition in §11.7.15 on page 521.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

It is just too costly in bits for the RNG-REQ message. 'MS Previous IP Address' is a string of at least 7 characters, and probably much more. For the TLV, that is at least 13 bytes, and probably much more. The target BS is going to have to acquire the information over the backbone from the serving BS.

There is no specific reason given why 'MS Previous IP Address' is any different than any other MS context item that is transferred over the backbone. The items in RNG-REQ are reserved for those essential information elements to give the target BS 1) the reason the RNG-REQ is happening (HO, re-entry from Idle Mode, etc...), and/or 2) the most basic information needed so the target BS can get the MS' context from the serving BS, if it does not already have it.

Networking layers violation

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions**    |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5107**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 45 Starting Line # 35 Fig/Table# Section 6.3.2.3.5

The Commenter elected to withdraw comment 4050, however comment 4050 was entirely correct and should be applied.

This is just an oversight. The feature 'MAC Version (11.1.3)' as an included, required TLV already exists in the base standard 802.16-2004, page 49, paragraph 7:

'The following parameters shall be included in the RNG-REQ message when transmitted during initial ranging on the SS's Basic connection:

MAC Version (11.1.3)'

Since an MS is always also an SS unless specifically excepted otherwise in the 16e DRAFT (and it is not excepted in this case; an MS uses the same RNG-REQ/RSP mechanics as an SS in all cases, but with a few extra TLVs available), and an MS always performs initial ranging as part of any network entry, re-entry, or HO (we have kept the language and mechanics consistent; though an MS may have access to predefined codes, etc.... it does not abrogate the basic initial ranging process as defined in the base standard), the requirement that 'MAC Version' be included as part of an MS initial ranging holds true for MS just as for SS. The corollary is that all of the other required and optional TLVs for SS in the base standard also apply to MS, for all applicable MAC management messages, except in instances where we have specifically excepted MS use of TLVs in the 16e DRAFT. Any other interpretation is ridiculous.

So the inclusion of language just for MS on page 45, line 29 (shown below) in the 16e DRAFT is duplicate and redundant since the base document **requires** inclusion of 'MAC Version' during any initial ranging, regardless of the type of network entry, re-entry, or HO that it precedes:

'The following parameter may be included in the RNG-REQ message when the MS is attempting to perform network re-entry or handover and the MS has a valid HMAC Tuple necessary to expedite security authentication.

HMAC Tuple (see 11.1.2)

MAC Version (11.1.3)

The HMAC Tuple shall be the last attribute in the message.'

#### Suggested Remedy

*[In 6.3.2.3.5 Ranging Request (RNG\_REQ) message, page 45, lines 29-37, modify as:]*

'The following parameter may be included in the RNG-REQ message when the MS is attempting to perform network re-entry or handover and the MS has a valid HMAC Tuple necessary to expedite security authentication.

HMAC Tuple (see 11.1.2)

~~MAC Version (11.1.3)~~

The HMAC Tuple shall be the last attribute in the message.'

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[In 6.3.2.3.5 Ranging Request (RNG\_REQ) message, page 45, lines 29-37, modify as:]*

'The following parameter may be included in the RNG-REQ message when the MS is attempting to perform network re-entry or handover and the MS has a valid HMAC Tuple necessary to expedite security authentication.

HMAC Tuple (see 11.1.2)

~~MAC Version (11.1.3)~~

The HMAC Tuple shall be the last attribute in the message.'



**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*Change the text on lines 28-37 to read as follows:*

'The following parameter may be included in the RNG-REQ message when the MS is attempting to perform network re-entry or handover and the MS has a valid HMAC Tuple necessary to expedite security authentication. HMAC Tuple (see 11.1.2) The HMAC Tuple shall be the last attribute in the message.'

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5108**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ45(subclause=6.3.2.3.6,page=46,line=17): Wrong notation**

Starting Page # **46**

Starting Line # **17**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.6**

Suggested Remedy

**==>0b00, etc.**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**==>0b00, etc.**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5109**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **47** Starting Line # **62** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.7**

Header of Section 6.3.2.3.7 not shown correctly

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert newline between "handshake." and "Registration Request"  
Change fonttype and settings of "Registration Request (REG-REQ) message" to that of the correct headertype.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Insert newline between "handshake." and "Registration Request"  
Change fonttype and settings of "Registration Request (REG-REQ) message" to that of the correct headertype.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5110**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **48** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.7**  
The list of TLVs in a REG-REQ does not include those required by an MS that supports mobility.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert the following text:

"For an MS that supports mobility, the REG-REQ (on initial network entry) shall contain the following TLVs:

Handoff supported (11.7.11)

Mobility parameters support (11.7.13)

Sleep-mode recovery time (11.7.14)"

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

Insert the following text:

For an MS, the REG-REQ (on initial network entry) shall contain the following TLVs:

Handover supported (11.7.11)

Mobility parameters support (11.7.13)

Globally replace all "Handoff" with "Handover".

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Insert the following text:

For an MS, the REG-REQ (on initial network entry) shall contain the following TLVs:

Handover supported (11.7.11)

Mobility parameters support (11.7.13)

Globally replace all "Handoff" with "Handover" (includes "handoff", "hand-off")

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5111**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	48	Starting Line #	20	Fig/Table#	Section
The text describes network re-entry after HO and return from Idle mode, not normal operations								

**Suggested Remedy**

## Change

For mobile subscribers ~~in normal operation~~, when the information is available to create CID update TLV, the target BS shall include the CID\_update and SAID\_update TLVs in the REG-RSP for an MS recognized by the target BS as performing HO or Network Re-entry from Idle Mode. The target BS recognizes an MS performing Network Re-entry from Idle Mode by the presence of a serving BSID or Paging Controller ID and Ranging Purpose Indication with bit#0 set to 1 in the RNG-REQ message.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

## Change

For mobile ~~stations subscribers in normal operation~~, when the information is available to create CID update TLV, the target BS shall include the CID\_update and SAID\_update TLVs in the REG-RSP for an MS recognized by the target BS as performing HO or Network Re-entry from Idle Mode. The target BS recognizes an MS performing Network Re-entry from Idle Mode by the presence of a serving BSID or Paging Controller ID and Ranging Purpose Indication with bit#0 set to 1 in the RNG-REQ message.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5112

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5112**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **48** Starting Line # **23** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.8**

BS may include the CID\_Update TLV in REG-RSP message. It can also use the Compressed CID Update TLV instead of CID\_Update TLV in order to reduce the length of REG-RSP message.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the subclause 6.3.2.3.8 as follows.

**6.3.2.3.8 Registration Response (REG-RSP) message**

[Insert into 6.3.2.3.8 immediately before Table 22:]

For mobile ~~stations subscribers in normal operation~~, when the information is available to create CID update TLV, the target BS shall include the CID\_update and SAID\_update TLVs in the REG-RSP for an MS recognized by the target BS as performing HO or Network Re-entry from Idle Mode. BS may include the Compressed CID Update TLV instead of the CID update TLV in REG-RSP message if CID update procedure is required. The target BS recognizes an MS performing Network Re-entry from Idle Mode by the presence of a serving BSID or Paging Controller ID and Ranging Purpose Indication with bit#0 set to 1 in the RNG-REQ message.

**CID\_update**

The CID\_update is a compound TLV value that provides a shorthand method for replacing the active connections used by the MS in its previous serving BS. Each CID\_update TLV specifies a CID in the target BS that shall replace a CID used in the previous serving BS. Multiple instances of CID\_update may occur in the REG-RSP to facilitate re-creating and re-assigning admitted or active service flows for the MS from its previous serving BS. If any of the service flow parameters change (including Target SAID, see 11.3.18), then those service flow parameter encoding TLVs that have changed will be added. If the BS cannot re-establish a particular service flow, it shall not include an instance of CID\_update for that service flow. These TLVs enable the target BS to renew connections used in the previous serving BS, but with different QoS settings.

**Compressed CID update**

The Compressed CID update TLV also provides a method for replacing the active connections used by the MS in its previous serving BS as CID update TLV. It can diminish the length of REG-RSP message. CID update and Compressed CID update TLVs shall be exclusively included in REG-RSP message. (see 11.7.8.9)

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

Change the subclause 6.3.2.3.8 as follows.

**6.3.2.3.8 Registration Response (REG-RSP) message**

[Insert into 6.3.2.3.8 immediately before Table 22:]

For mobile ~~stations subscribers in normal operation~~, when the information is available to create CID update TLV, the target BS shall include the CID\_update and SAID\_update TLVs in the REG-RSP for an MS recognized by the target BS as performing HO or Network Re-entry from Idle Mode. BS may include the Compressed CID Update TLV instead of the CID update TLV in REG-RSP message if CID update procedure is required. The target BS recognizes an MS performing Network Re-entry from Idle Mode by the presence of a serving BSID or Paging Controller ID and Ranging Purpose Indication with bit#0 set to 1 in the RNG-REQ message.

**CID\_update**

The CID\_update is a compound TLV value that provides a shorthand method for replacing the active connections used by the MS in its previous serving BS. Each CID\_update TLV specifies a CID in the target BS that shall replace a CID used in the previous serving BS. Multiple instances of CID\_update may occur in the REG-RSP to facilitate re-creating and re-assigning admitted or active service flows

Multiple instances of CID\_update may occur in the REG-RSP to facilitate re-creating and re-assigning admitted or active service flows for the MS from its previous serving BS. If any of the service flow parameters change (including Target SAID, see 11.3.18), then those service flow parameter encoding TLVs that have changed will be added. If the BS cannot re-establish a particular service flow, it shall not include an instance of CID\_update for that service flow. These TLVs enable the target BS to renew connections used in the previous serving BS, but with different QoS settings.

#### **Compressed CID update**

The Compressed CID update TLV also provides a method for replacing the active connections used by the MS in its previous serving BS as CID update TLV. It can diminish the length of REG-RSP message. CID update and Compressed CID update TLVs shall be exclusively included in REG-RSP message. (see 11.7.8.9)

#### **Reason for Recommendation**

#### **Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Change the subclause 6.3.2.3.8 as follows.

#### **6.3.2.3.8 Registration Response (REG-RSP) message**

[Insert into 6.3.2.3.8 immediately before Table 22:]

For mobile ~~stations subscribers in normal operation~~, when the information is available to create CID update TLV, the target BS shall include the CID\_update and SAID\_update TLVs in the REG-RSP for an MS recognized by the target BS as performing HO or Network Re-entry from Idle Mode. BS may include the Compressed CID Update TLV instead of the CID update TLV in REG-RSP message if CID update procedure is required. The target BS recognizes an MS performing Network Re-entry from Idle Mode by the presence of a serving BSID or Paging Controller ID and Ranging Purpose Indication with bit#0 set to 1 in the RNG-REQ message.

#### **CID\_update**

The CID\_update is a compound TLV value that provides a shorthand method for replacing the active connections used by the MS in its previous serving BS. Each CID\_update TLV specifies a CID in the target BS that shall replace a CID used in the previous serving BS. Multiple instances of CID\_update may occur in the REG-RSP to facilitate re-creating and re-assigning admitted or active service flows for the MS from its previous serving BS. If any of the service flow parameters change (including Target SAID, see 11.3.18), then those service flow parameter encoding TLVs that have changed will be added. If the BS cannot re-establish a particular service flow, it shall not include an instance of CID\_update for that service flow. These TLVs enable the target BS to renew connections used in the previous serving BS, but with different QoS settings.

#### **Compressed CID update**

The Compressed CID update TLV also provides a method for replacing the active connections used by the MS in its previous serving BS as CID update TLV. It can diminish the length of REG-RSP message. CID update and Compressed CID update TLVs shall be exclusively included in REG-RSP message. (see 11.7.8.9)

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

#### **Group's Notes**

#### **Group's Action Items**

#### **Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

#### **Editor's Questions and Concerns**

#### **Editor's Action Items**

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5113**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	48	Starting Line #	23	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.3.14
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

Table 286c and 286d are out of order.

Table 286c shall be located in the subclause 8.4.5.3.15 HO DL MAP IE in non-anchor BS, and table 286d shall be located in the subclause 8.4.5.3.14 HO Anchor Active DL MAP IE.

There is also required clarification about both DL MAP IEs.

The HO Anchor Active UL MAP IE in 8.4.5.4.18 and HO Active Anchor UL MAP IE in 8.4.5.4.19 also require clarification for consistency with the above DL MAP IEs

#### Suggested Remedy

1. Change the subclause 8.4.5.3.14 and 8.4.5.3.15 as follows.

##### 8.4.5.3.14 HO Anchor Active DL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the DL-MAP of active non-anchor BS and indicates the burst from Anchor BS.

When an MSS receives a HO Anchor Active DL-MAP IE on DL-MAP message from an active non-anchor BS, it can decode a data burst transmitted from Anchor BS by using the 'Anchor Preamble' in HO Anchor Active DL-MAP IE.

##### 8.4.5.3.15 HO ~~Active Anchor~~ DL MAP IE in non-anchor BS

This MAP IE is in the DL-MAP of the anchor BS and indicates the burst from active non-anchor BS.

When an MSS receives a HO Active Anchor DL-MAP IE on DL-MAP message from an Anchor BS, it can decode a data burst transmitted from the active non-anchor BS by using the 'Active Preamble' in HO Active Anchor DL-MAP IE.

Table 286d-HO ~~Active Anchor~~ DL MAP IE in non-anchor BS

2. Then, exchange table 286c and 286d with each other except the title of both tables.

3. Then, in table 286c, replace 'HO Active\_Anchor DL MAP IE() {' with 'HO Anchor\_Active DL MAP IE() {'.  
in table 286d, replace 'HO Anchor\_Active DL MAP IE() {' with 'HO Active\_Anchor DL MAP IE() {'.

4. Change the subclause 8.4.5.3.18 and 8.4.5.3.19 as follows. (In Page 353 and 354 respectively)

##### 8.4.5.4.18 HO Anchor Active UL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the UL-MAP of an active non-anchor BS and indicates the burst from the Anchor BS.

When an MSS receives a HO Anchor Active UL-MAP IE on UL-MAP message from an active non-anchor BS, it can send a data burst to the Anchor BS by using the 'Anchor Preamble' in HO Anchor Active UL-MAP IE.

##### 8.4.5.4.19 HO Active Anchor UL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the UL-MAP of the anchor BS and indicates the burst from active non-anchor BS.

When an MSS receives a HO Active Anchor UL-MAP IE on UL-MAP message from an Anchor BS, it can send a data burst to the active non-anchor BS by using the 'Active Preamble' in HO Active Anchor UL-MAP IE.

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**      **Recommendation by**

1. Change the subclause 8.4.5.3.14 and 8.4.5.3.15 as follows.

8.4.5.3.14 HO Anchor Active DL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the DL-MAP of active non-anchor BS and indicates the burst from Anchor BS.

When an MS receives a HO Anchor Active DL-MAP IE on DL-MAP message from an active non-anchor BS, it can decode a data burst transmitted from Anchor BS by using the 'Anchor Preamble' in HO Anchor Active DL-MAP IE.

8.4.5.3.15 HO Active Anchor DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

This MAP IE is in the DL-MAP of the anchor BS and indicates the burst from active non-anchor BS.

When an MS receives a HO Active Anchor DL-MAP IE on DL-MAP message from an Anchor BS, it can decode a data burst transmitted from the active non-anchor BS by using the 'Active Preamble' in HO Active Anchor DL-MAP IE.

Table 286d-HO Active Anchor DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

2. Then, exchange table 286c and 286d with each other except the title of both tables.

3. Then, in table 286c, replace 'HO Active\_Anchor DL MAP IE() {' with 'HO Anchor\_Active DL MAP IE() {'.  
in table 286d, replace 'HO Anchor\_Active DL MAP IE() {' with 'HO Active\_Anchor DL MAP IE() {'.

4. Change the subclause 8.4.5.3.18 and 8.4.5.3.19 as follows. (In Page 353 and 354 respectively)

8.4.5.4.18 HO Anchor Active UL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the UL-MAP of an active non-anchor BS and indicates the burst from the Anchor BS.

When an MS receives a HO Anchor Active UL-MAP IE on UL-MAP message from an active non-anchor BS, it can send a data burst to the Anchor BS by using the 'Anchor Preamble' in HO Anchor Active UL-MAP IE.

8.4.5.4.19 HO Active Anchor UL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the UL-MAP of the anchor BS and indicates the burst from active non-anchor BS.

When an MS receives a HO Active Anchor UL-MAP IE on UL-MAP message from an Anchor BS, it can send a data burst to the active non-anchor BS by using the 'Active Preamble' in HO Active Anchor UL-MAP IE.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

1. Change the subclause 8.4.5.3.14 and 8.4.5.3.15 as follows.

#### 8.4.5.3.14 HO Anchor Active DL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the DL-MAP of active non-anchor BS and indicates the burst from Anchor BS.

When an MS receives a HO Anchor Active DL-MAP IE on DL-MAP message from an active non-anchor BS, it can decode a data burst transmitted from Anchor BS by using the 'Anchor Preamble' in HO Anchor Active DL-MAP IE.

#### 8.4.5.3.15 HO ~~Active Anchor~~ DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

This MAP IE is in the DL-MAP of the anchor BS and indicates the burst from active non-anchor BS.

When an MS receives a HO Active Anchor DL-MAP IE on DL-MAP message from an Anchor BS, it can decode a data burst transmitted from the active non-anchor BS by using the 'Active Preamble' in HO Active Anchor DL-MAP IE.

Table 286d-HO ~~Active Anchor~~ DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

2. Then, exchange table 286c and 286d with each other except the title of both tables.

3. Then, in table 286c, replace 'HO Active\_Anchor DL MAP IE() {' with 'HO Anchor\_Active DL MAP IE() {'.  
in table 286d, replace 'HO Anchor\_Active DL MAP IE() {' with 'HO Active\_Anchor DL MAP IE() {'.

4. Change the subclause 8.4.5.3.18 and 8.4.5.3.19 as follows. (In Page 353 and 354 respectively)

#### 8.4.5.4.18 HO Anchor Active UL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the UL-MAP of an active non-anchor BS and indicates the burst from the Anchor BS.

When an MS receives a HO Anchor Active UL-MAP IE on UL-MAP message from an active non-anchor BS, it can send a data burst to the Anchor BS by using the 'Anchor Preamble' in HO Anchor Active UL-MAP IE.

#### 8.4.5.4.19 HO Active Anchor UL MAP IE

This MAP IE is in the UL-MAP of the anchor BS and indicates the burst from active non-anchor BS.

When an MS receives a HO Active Anchor UL-MAP IE on UL-MAP message from an Anchor BS, it can send a data burst to the active non-anchor BS by using the 'Active Preamble' in HO Active Anchor UL-MAP IE.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5114**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **48** Starting Line # **56** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.8**

The list of TLVs in a REG-RSP does not include those required for a response to an MS that supports mobility.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert the following text:

"For an MS that supports mobility, the REG-RSP (on initial network entry) shall contain the following TLVs:Handoff supported (11.7.11)HO support (11.7.12)Mobility parameters support (11.7.13)Idle mode support (11.7.20)"**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Insert the following text:

For an MS, the REG-RSP (on initial network entry) shall contain the following TLVs:Handover supported (11.7.11)Mobility parameters support (11.7.13)**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Insert the following text:

For an MS, the REG-RSP (on initial network entry) shall contain the following TLVs:Handover supported (11.7.11)Mobility parameters support (11.7.13)**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This is in line with the resolution of comment 5110

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5115**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment      Type **Technical, Non-binding**      Starting Page # **48**      Starting Line # **61**      Fig/Table#      Section **6.3.2.3.9**

The BS doesn't know the completion time of the EAP-based authorization procedure in case that EAP protocol doesn't yield AAA-key. In addition, the BS doesn't know whether an MS receives the last PKMv2 EAP Transfer message (such as "EAP Success" used in EAP-TLS) or not. Both the BS and the MS cannot simultaneously share the AK derived from PMK, when an MS doesn't receive the last PKMv2 EAP Transfer message.

Therefore, it is necessary that a MS notifies the completeness of the EAP-based authorization procedure to the BS.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/276.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

*In section 6.3.2.3.9 Privacy key management (PKM) messages, Table 26*

Delete the following row

| 29 | EAP start | PKM-REQ |

*Also update the reserved value appropriately*

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

*In section 6.3.2.3.9 Privacy key management (PKM) messages, Table 26*

Delete the following row

| 29 | EAP start | PKM-REQ |

*Also update the reserved value appropriately*

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5116**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment	Type <b>Editorial</b>	Starting Page # <b>48</b>	Starting Line # <b>61</b>	Fig/Table#	Section <b>6.3.2.3.9</b>
---------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	------------	--------------------------

There are PKMv1 and PKMv2. The PKMv1-related text and the PKMv2-related text are disorganized and mixed up.

For example,

- 1) 7.2.2 PKM version 2 and 7.8 PKMv2 has the same title, but most of the clauses in section 7 in 802.16e/D7 related to PKMv2, so it must be correctly modified.
- 2) 7.2.2.1 Security Associations, formerly TEK exchange overview for PMP topology in IEEE Std. 802.16-2004, and the 7.2.2.3 and its subclause 7.2.2.3.1 Security Associations have the same subclause title and deal with the similar concepts, and so on.

#### Suggested Remedy

Correct a table of contents and editorial text in the security-related parts

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

No specific text. Re-organization requires the 802.16-2004 to be revised which cannot be done till a next revision PAR is initiated in the future for the base document and amendments.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5117**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	49	Starting Line #	1	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.9
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-----------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: Also a problem with incorrect change of SS to MS for existing text on page 49, line 1 in the 16e/D8 document; page 54, paragraph immediately preceding Table 25 of 802.16-2004. Change to MS from SS would remove necessary specification in the 802.16-2004 document. This MUST be fixed.

**Suggested Remedy***[In 6.3.2.3.9 Privacy key management (PKM) messages (PKM-REQ/PKM-RSP), page 49, line 1, modify as:]*

'PKM protocol messages transmitted from the BS to the ~~MS~~ SS shall use the form shown in Table 25. They are transmitted on the SSs Primary Management Connection. When the BS sends PKM-RSP message in key push mode to MS for ~~the~~ multicast service or ~~the~~ broadcast service, it may be carried on the Broadcast connection.'

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted***[In 6.3.2.3.9 Privacy key management (PKM) messages (PKM-REQ/PKM-RSP), page 49, line 1, modify as:]*

'PKM protocol messages transmitted from the BS to the ~~MS~~ SS shall use the form shown in Table 25. They are transmitted on the SSs Primary Management Connection. When the BS sends PKM-RSP message in key push mode to MS for ~~the~~ multicast service or ~~the~~ broadcast service, it may be carried on the Broadcast connection.'

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

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5118**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment

Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **49**Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.2.3.9**

It is necessary to add the term, "PKMv2," at the front of messages which are for the PKMv2.

**Suggested Remedy**

The Identifier field in **PKMv2** EAP-Transfer messages, **PKMv2** Authenticated EAP messages, and in Authentication Information messages, which are informative and do not effect any response messaging, shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in a BS's PKM-RSP message shall match the Identifier field of the **PKMREQ** **PKM-REQ** message the BS is responding to. The Identifier field in TEK Invalid messages and **PKMv2 TEK Invalid messages**, which are not sent in response to ~~PKMREQs~~ **PKM-REQs**, shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in unsolicited Authorization Invalid messages shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in **PKMv2 Group** Key Update Command messages, which are used to distribute the updated GTEK and traffic keying material, shall be set to zero.

On reception of a PKM-RSP message, the MS associates the message with a particular state machine (the Authorization state machine in the case of Authorization Replies Authorization Rejects, and Authorization Invalids **for the PKMv1, PKMv2 RSA Reply, PKMv2 RSA Reject, PKMv2 EAP Transfer, PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge, SA-TEK-Request, PKMv2 SA\_TEK-Response for the PKMv2**; a particular TEK state machine in the case of Key Replies, Key Rejects, and TEK Invalids **for the PKMv1, PKMv2 Key Reply, PKMv2 Key Reject, PKMv2 TEK Invalids, and PKMv2 Group** Key Update Commands **for the PKMv2**).

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

The Identifier field in **PKMv2** EAP-Transfer messages, **PKMv2** Authenticated EAP messages, and in Authentication Information messages, which are informative and do not effect any response messaging, shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in a BS's PKM-RSP message shall match the Identifier field of the **PKMREQ** **PKM-REQ** message the BS is responding to. The Identifier field in TEK Invalid messages and **PKMv2 TEK Invalid messages**, which are not sent in response to ~~PKMREQs~~ **PKM-REQs**, shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in unsolicited Authorization Invalid messages shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in **PKMv2 Group** Key Update Command messages, which are used to distribute the updated GTEK and traffic keying material, shall be set to zero.

On reception of a PKM-RSP message, the ~~MS~~ **SS** associates the message with a particular state machine (the Authorization state machine in the case of Authorization Replies Authorization Rejects, and Authorization Invalids **for the PKMv1, PKMv2 RSA Reply, PKMv2 RSA Reject, PKMv2 EAP Transfer, PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge, SA-TEK-Request, PKMv2 SA\_TEK-Response for the PKMv2**; a particular TEK state machine in the case of Key Replies, Key Rejects, and TEK Invalids **for the PKMv1, PKMv2 Key Reply, PKMv2 Key Reject, PKMv2 TEK Invalids, and PKMv2 Group** Key Update Commands **for the PKMv2**).

**Reason for Recommendation**

Also includes resolution from comment #5119

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

The Identifier field in **PKMv2** EAP-Transfer messages, **PKMv2** Authenticated EAP messages, and in Authentication Information messages, which are informative and do not effect any response messaging, shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in a BS's PKM-RSP message shall match the Identifier field of the

to zero. The Identifier field in a BS or PM-REQ message shall match the Identifier field of the PKMREQ PKM-REQ message the BS is responding to. The Identifier field in TEK Invalid messages and PKMv2 TEK Invalid messages, which are not sent in response to ~~PKMREQs~~ PKM-REQs, shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in unsolicited Authorization Invalid messages shall be set to zero. The Identifier field in PKMv2 Group Key Update Command messages, which are used to distribute the updated GTEK and traffic keying material, shall be set to zero.

On reception of a PKM-RSP message, the MS SS associates the message with a particular state machine (the Authorization state machine in the case of Authorization Replies Authorization Rejects, and Authorization Invalids for the PKMv1, PKMv2 RSA Reply, PKMv2 RSA Reject, PKMv2 EAP Transfer, PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge, ~~SA-TEK-Request~~, PKMv2 SA\_TEK-Response for the PKMv2; a particular TEK state machine in the case of Key Replies, Key Rejects, and TEK Invalids for the PKMv1, PKMv2 Key Reply, PKMv2 Key Reject, PKMv2 TEK Invalids, and PKMv2 Group Key Update Commands for the PKMv2).

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5119**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **49** Starting Line # **18** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.9**  
 I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarassment to the membership.

Problem: And again, the same problem on page 49, line 18 in the 16e/D8 document; page 55, paragraph 4 under PKM Identifier in 802.16-2004. Change to MS from SS would remove necessary specification in the 802.16-2004 document. This MUST be fixed.

**Suggested Remedy***[In 6.3.2.3.9 Privacy key management (PKM) messages (PKM-REQ/PKM-RSP), page 49, line 18, modify as:]*

'On reception of a PKM-RSP message, the ~~MS~~ SS associates the message with a particular state machine (the Authorization state machine in the case of Authorization Replies, Authorization Rejects, and Authorization Invalids; a particular TEK state machine in the case of Key Replies, Key Rejects, ~~and TEK Invalids~~ TEK Invalids, Key Update Commands).'

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Superseded****Recommendation by**

See comment #5118

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment #5118

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** ( ) none needed

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5120**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 49 Starting Line # 64 Fig/Table# 26 Section 6.3.2.3.9

Inconsistency of the PKM message codes of the table 26 and the sections describing each message types in 6.3.2.3.9.15 through 6.3.2.3.9.26.

Suggested Remedy

Move the PKMv2 EAP Start (currently, code 17) to code 28 position and decrease the code numbers by one for all message types from PKMv2 EAP-Transfer through PKMv2 Group-Key-Update-Command.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5128

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment #5128

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5121**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **50** Starting Line # **27** Fig/Table# **26** Section **6.3.2.3.9**

As the PKMv2 EAP Start message is defined for PKMv2 EAP transfer, a PKMv2 Authenticated EAP Start message should be defined for PKMv2 Authenticated EAP transfer. No longer need an EAP Start message.

**Suggested Remedy**

PKM message type for code 29 should be changed from "EAP start" to "Authenticated EAP Start".

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Only one "EAP start" is enough for both EAP and Authenticated EAP. There is no need for separate "Authenticated EAP Start".

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Only one "EAP start" is enough for both EAP and Authenticated EAP. There is no need for separate "Authenticated EAP Start".

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5122**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **50** Starting Line # **30**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.9**

For full operation, the PKMv2 needs Auth Invalid and Auth Info messages.

**Suggested Remedy**

[Add following contents below the Table 26]

**Auth Invalid and Auth Info messages can be used in the PKMv1 and the PKMv2.**

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

[Add following sentence below the Table 26]

**Auth Invalid and Auth Info messages may be used in PKMv1 and PKMv2.**

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

[Add following sentence below the Table 26]

**Auth Invalid and Auth Info messages may be used in PKMv1 and PKMv2.**

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions **k) done****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5123**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **50** Starting Line # **35** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.9.11**

The contents of contribution #229r3 are not fully applied in the P802.16e/D8. The corresponding commentary (#4064) was already accepted.2005/06/08

**Suggested Remedy**

[Add following contents in sub-clause 6.3.2.3.9.11]

6.3.2.3.9.11 PKMv2 RSA-Request message

**A client MS sends a PKMv2 RSA-Request message to the BS in order to request mutual authentication in the RSA-based authorization.**

Code: 13

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[Add following contents in sub-clause 6.3.2.3.9.11]

6.3.2.3.9.11 PKMv2 RSA-Request message

**A client MS sends a PKMv2 RSA-Request message to the BS in order to request mutual authentication in the RSA-based authorization.**

Code: 13

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions **k) done****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5124**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **50** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# **37a** Section **6.3.2.3.9.11**

Both EAP-based authentication and RSA-based authorization shall be followed by the SA-TEK 3-way handshake, whereby the MS's primary SAID (e.g., basic CID) was removed from the PKMv2 RSA-Request (former Auth-Request) attributes. Instead, the primary SAID is included in the SA-TEK-Request, but it's not.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert a row that says:

SAID | MS's primary SAID equal to the Basic CID

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

In page 50, line 53, Table 37a:

Insert a row that says:

SAID | MS's primary SAID equal to the Basic CID

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

In page 50, line 53, Table 37a:

Insert a row that says:

SAID | MS's primary SAID equal to the Basic CID

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

SA TEK Update is only included on handover.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5125**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **51**Starting Line # **26**Fig/Table# **37b**Section **6.3.2.3.9.12**

Attribute names of PKMv2 RSA-Reply message is wrong.

**Suggested Remedy**

From line 26 through 30, change the attribute names in the first column of table 37b:

Encrypted ~~pre~~-PAK~~PAK~~ Lifetime~~PAK~~ Sequence Number**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

From line 26 through 30, change the attribute names in the first column of table 37b:

Encrypted ~~pre~~-PAK~~AK~~ Key Lifetime~~AK~~ Key Sequence Number

Also make the following changes for consistency with 802.16-2004

*[Insert the following section 11.9.4 and modify as]*

## 11.9.4 Key lifetime

Description: This attribute contains the lifetime, in seconds, of an AK or a TEK or a PAK, or a PMK. It is a 32-bit unsigned quantity representing the number of remaining seconds for which the associated key shall be valid. Note that this attribute can be used as a single TLV or as part of a compound TLV top-level attribute (AK) as well as a subattribute (TEK).

*[In the subsequent table (lines 14, 15) change the following note]*— A key lifetime of zero indicates that the corresponding ~~key AK or TEK~~ is not valid.*[Insert the following section 11.9.5 and modify as]*

## 11.9.5 Key-Sequence-Number

Description: This attribute contains sequence number for a TEK or AK or a PAK, or a PMK. The 2-bit or 4-bit quantity, however, is stored in a single byte, with the high-order 6 or 4 bits set to 0. A summary of the Key-Sequence-Number attribute format is shown below. Note that this attribute can be used as a single TLV or as part of a compound TLV top-level attribute (AK) as well as a subattribute (TEK).

*[In the subsequent table (line 32) change the following note]*— 4-bit sequence number (AK, PAK, PMK).**Reason for Recommendation**

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

From line 26 through 30, change the attribute names in the first column of table 37b:

Encrypted ~~pre-~~PAK

~~AK~~ Key Lifetime

~~AK~~ Key Sequence Number

Also make the following changes for consistency with 802.16-2004

*[Insert the following section 11.9.4 and modify as]*

## 11.9.4 Key lifetime

Description: This attribute contains the lifetime, in seconds, of an AK or a TEK or a PAK, or a PMK. It is a 32-bit unsigned quantity representing the number of remaining seconds for which the associated key shall be valid. Note that this attribute can be used as a single TLV or as part of a compound TLV top-level attribute (AK) as well as a subattribute (TEK).

*[In the table (lines 14, 15) change the following note]*

— A key lifetime of zero indicates that the corresponding ~~key AK or TEK~~ is not valid.

*[Insert the following section 11.9.5 and modify as]*

## 11.9.5 Key-Sequence-Number

Description: This attribute contains sequence number for a TEK or AK or a PAK, or a PMK. The 2-bit or 4-bit quantity, however, is stored in a single byte, with the high-order 6 or 4 bits set to 0. A summary of the Key-Sequence-Number attribute format is shown below. Note that this attribute can be used as a single TLV or as part of a compound TLV top-level attribute (AK) as well as a subattribute (TEK).

*[In the table (line 32) change the following note]*

— 4-bit sequence number (AK, PAK, PMK).

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

We needed to make the TLV definitions consistent to implement this comment.

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

## Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5126**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **53** Starting Line # **22** Fig/Table# **37e** Section **6.3.2.3.9.15**

Attribute names of PKMv2 EAP Transfer and PKMv2 authenticated EAP Transfer messages is wrong.

**Suggested Remedy**

On line 21 and line 51, EAP ~~protecol~~ **payload**

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On line 21 and line 51, EAP ~~protecol~~ **payload**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5127**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **53** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# **37f** Section **6.3.2.3.9.16**

The Message Digest of a PKMv2 Authenticated EAP message is calculated using EIK. Since EIK is 128-bit key, only OMAC digest can be used.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the following change:

CMAC/~~HMAC~~-Digest**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Make the following change:

CMAC/~~HMAC~~-Digest**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Make the following change:

CMAC/~~HMAC~~-Digest**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This makes it consistent with page 536, line 46 and 47 where only CMAC digest is permitted.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5128**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **54** Starting Line # **1**Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.9.17**

1. Correct code number based on the Table 26.
2. Renumber a table of contents.
3. Rename some messages defined in the PKMv2. In other words, add the term "PKMv2."

**Suggested Remedy**~~6.3.2.3.9.17 SA-TEK-Challenge message~~

6.3.2.3.9.18 PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge message

Code: ~~19~~ 20~~6.3.2.3.9.18 SA-TEK-Request message~~

6.3.2.3.9.19 PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request message

Code: ~~20~~ 21~~6.3.2.3.9.19 SA-TEK-Response message~~

6.3.2.3.9.20 PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response message

Code: ~~21~~ 22

6.3.2.3.9.21 PKMv2 Key-Request message

Code: ~~22~~ 23

6.3.2.3.9.22 PKMv2 Key-Reply message

Code: ~~23~~ 24

6.3.2.3.9.23 PKMv2 Key-Reject message

Code: ~~24~~ 25

6.3.2.3.9.24 PKMv2 SA-Addition message

Code: ~~25~~ 26

6.3.2.3.9.25 PKMv2 TEK-Invalid message

Code: ~~26~~ 27

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

*[Delete subclause 6.3.2.3.9.27 EAP Start ]*

*[Insert the following subclause 6.3.2.3.9.15]*

6.3.2.3.9.15 PKMv2 EAP Start message

When an MS seeks to initiate an EAP-based authentication or reauthentication procedure with a BS, it sends a PKMv2 EAP Start message.

Code: 17

This message has no attributes.

*Replace the following sub clauses with changes in titles and code values based on table 26 as shown:*

6.3.2.3.9.~~45~~16 PKMv2 EAP Transfer message

Code: ~~47~~ 18

--

6.3.2.3.9.~~46~~17 PKMv2 Authenticated EAP Transfer message

Code: ~~48~~ 19

--

6.3.2.3.9.~~47~~ 18 PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge message

Code: ~~49~~ 20

*Replace the table 37g title with:*

**PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge message attributes**

--

6.3.2.3.9.18 ~~19~~ PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request message

Code: ~~20~~ 21

*Replace the table 37h title with:*

PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request message attributes

--

6.3.2.3.9.19~~20~~ PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response message

Code: ~~24~~ 22

*Replace the table 37i title with:*

PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response message attributes

--

*In the following sub clauses only change the code values based on table 26 as shown:*

6.3.2.3.9.21 PKMv2 Key-Request message

Code: ~~22~~ 23

6.3.2.3.9.22 PKMv2 Key-Reply message

Code: ~~23~~ 24

6.3.2.3.9.23 PKMv2 Key-Reject message

Code: ~~24~~ 25

6.3.2.3.9.24 PKMv2 SA-Addition message

Code: ~~25~~ 26

6.3.2.3.9.25 PKMv2 TEK-Invalid message

Code: ~~26~~ 27

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*[Delete subclause 6.3.2.3.9.27 EAP Start ]*

*[Insert the following subsclause 6.3.2.3.9.15]*

**6.3.2.3.9.15 PKMv2 EAP Start message**

When an MS seeks to initiate an EAP-based authentication or reauthentication procedure with a BS, it sends a PKMv2 EAP Start message.

Code: 17

This message has no attributes.

*Replace the following sub clauses with changes in titles and code values based on table 26 as shown:*

**6.3.2.3.9.45~~16~~ PKMv2 EAP Transfer message**

Code: ~~47~~ 18

--

**6.3.2.3.9.46~~17~~ PKMv2 Authenticated EAP Transfer message**

Code: ~~48~~ 19

--

**6.3.2.3.9.47~~18~~ PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge message**

Code: ~~49~~ 20

*Replace the table 37g title with:*



**PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge message attributes**

--

**6.3.2.3.9.48~~19~~ PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request message**

Code: ~~20~~ 21



Code:  

*Replace the table 37h title with:*  
PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request message attributes

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

EAP Start was moved and changed by another comment. I've left it in the document so this can be sorted out.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5129**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	54	Starting Line #	1	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.9.17
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	--------------

From IETF review:

As described in [RFC3748] Section 7.15 verifying the authenticator identity between the EAP peer, authenticator and server protects against impersonation attacks.

....

In order to bind identities to the keying material, the lower layer authenticator and peer identities need to be explicitly stated within the 3-way handshake, and bound to PMK.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt contribution "Binding of PMK to EAP channel parameters" ( C80216e-5\_217r2 )

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

[Add the following to table 37g following the AKID attribute:]

AuthenticatorId | the identity of the EAP authenticator associated with the BS

[Add the following to 11.7.23 following the AKID attribute:]

AuthenticatorId | the identity of the EAP authenticator associated with the BS

[Add the following to table 37h following the AKID attribute:]

PeerId | the MAC Address of the MS

[section 7.8.1 Add a new numbered item in between 2 and 3:]

3. If the MS supports EAP methods with the channel binding property, and it received the AuthenticatorId via the EAP method, it shall check whether BS supplied the same AuthenticatorId in the SA-TEK-Challenge. If the AuthenticatorId does not match or was not supplied, the MS SHOULD log the event as a possible security breach and the MS may elect to terminate communication with the BS.

[Add the following to page 528, line 62 following the AKID attribute:]

AuthenticatorId | code | variable | the identity of the EAP authenticator associated with the BS if supplied by the EAP method.

[insert new section 11.9.35:]

AuthenticatorId

AuthenticatorId

Description: The Identity of the EAP Authenticator associated with the BS. This is the value that is sent in the NAS\_Identifier AAA attribute

Type	Length	Value
Tbd	variable	Identity of the EAP Authenticator associated with the BS

[insert new section 11.9.36:]

PeerId

Description: The MAC address of the SS. This is the value that is sent in the Calling-Station-Id AAA attribute

Type	Length	Value
Tbd	6	MAC address of the SS

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group                      Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

There is no exact description to verify authenticator.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    ) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5130**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **54**

Starting Line # **21**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.9.17**

Both RandomBS and BS\_Random are used to indicate a 6-byte random number generated by BS. Use only one for clarity.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace every "RandomBS" with "BS\_Random" throughout the entire document.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Replace every "RandomBS" with "BS\_Random" throughout the entire document.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5131**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Starting Page # 54 Starting Line # 24 Fig/Table# 37g Section 6.3.2.3.9.17

The AK context (Table 133, page 217) includes an "AK Lifetime" derived from the PAK and/or PMK lifetime. However, for EAP-based authentication, the PMK lifetime is provided by the Authentication Server to the Authenticator (BS) and not to the Supplicant (MS). Therefore the BS must relay the PMK lifetime to the MS.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following attribute to the SA-TEK-Challenge message:

- AK Lifetime. AK aging timer

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Superceded****Recommendation by**[See comment #5347](#)**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superceded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment #5347](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5132**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding** Starting Page # **55ff** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.43.6.1**  
 6 deep for subclause numbering was silly, but 7 deep is so ridiculous that it defies description. The editor needs to exercise control and reduce all subclause numbering to less than 5, preferably 4 or less.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change as indicated here and throughout the draft. The depth of numbering used for subclauses is completely unnecessary. 802.16e can and should work not to replicate the errors in 802.16-2004. If you don't start to fix them now, when will you do it? There is always a way to avoid this numbering for new clauses. You can also suggest fixes for the old draft as well. You don't have to work within the confines of the mistakes of the previous editors.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation**

This is an amendment draft, not a revision draft. To fix the problem we would have to restructure the base document entirely, possibly changing context, relationships, and dependencies, all of which is out-of-scope. Silly or not, we are constrained by the document we are amending. The IEEE staff obviously did not think it was *excessively* silly when they approved the 802.16-2004 document only last year. When we conduct our next revision of the standard, we can correct this problem.

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This is an amendment draft, not a revision draft. To fix the problem we would have to restructure the base document entirely, possibly changing context, relationships, and dependencies, all of which is out-of-scope. Silly or not, we are constrained by the document we are amending. The IEEE staff obviously did not think it was *excessively* silly when they approved the 802.16-2004 document only last year. When we conduct our next revision of the standard, we can correct this problem.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5133**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	55	Starting Line #	9	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.9.18
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	--------------

A 64-bit random number for an attribute of SA-TEK-Request should be MS\_random.

**Suggested Remedy**

1. Change the attribute "NonceMS" to "MS\_random".
2. Change the content description of the NonceMS as following:  
A 64-bit number chosen by the MS (once per protocol run). ~~This can be a counter or a random number.~~
3. Change the SA-TEK-Response attribute "NonceMS" to "MS\_random" accordingly on line 39, page 55.

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation: Accepted-Modified</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	--	--------------------------

1. Change the attribute "NonceMS" to "MS\_Random".
2. Change the content description of the NonceMS as following:  
A 64-bit number chosen by the MS **freshly for every new handshake.** ~~(once per protocol run). This can be a counter or a random number.~~
3. Change the SA-TEK-Response attribute "NonceMS" to "MS\_Random" accordingly on line 39, page 55.

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified</b>
----------------------------	---

1. Change the attribute "NonceMS" to "MS\_Random".
2. Change the content description of the NonceMS as following:  
A 64-bit number chosen by the MS **freshly for every new handshake.** ~~(once per protocol run). This can be a counter or a random number.~~
3. Change the SA-TEK-Response attribute "NonceMS" to "MS\_Random" accordingly on line 39, page 55.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

<b>Editor's Notes</b>	<b>Editor's Actions</b> k) done
-----------------------	---------------------------------

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5134**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon**

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **55** Starting Line # **21** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.9.19**

The contents of contribution #231r2 are not fully applied in the P802.16e/D8. The corresponding commentary (#4070) was already accepted.

**Suggested Remedy**

1. Apply the attribute, "(one or more) SA-Descriptor(s)," into Table 37i as defined in the contribution #231r2 (sub-clause 6.3.2.3.9.19)
2. Delete sub-clause 6.3.2.3.9.20 SA-TEK-Update message.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

1. Apply the attribute, "(one or more) SA-Descriptor(s)," into Table 37i as defined in the contribution #231r2 (sub-clause 6.3.2.3.9.19)
2. Delete sub-clause 6.3.2.3.9.20 SA-TEK-Update message.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

1. Apply the attribute, "(one or more) SA-Descriptor(s)," into Table 37i as defined in the contribution #231r2 (sub-clause 6.3.2.3.9.19)
2. Delete sub-clause 6.3.2.3.9.20 SA-TEK-Update message.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5135**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	55	Starting Line #	21	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.9.19
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

From IETF review:

[AAAKEY] states:

" The selection of the "best" ciphersuite MUST be securely confirmed. The mechanism MUST detect attempted roll back attacks."

IEEE 802.16e securely confirms selection of the "best" ciphersuite within the 3-way handshake, but it does not securely confirm other "security-relevant" capabilities such as the MAC algorithm or replay window size.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt contribution C80216e-05\_207.pdf (Tian Feng/Li Rui)

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by***In 6.3.2.3.9.18 SA-TEK-Request message**[Insert into table 37h the following row before the last CMAC row]*

Table 37h—SA-TEK-Request message attributes

**Security Negotiation Parameters | Describes requesting MS's security capabilities (see 11.8.4)***In 6.3.2.3.9.19 SA-TEK-Response message**[Insert into the table 37i the following row ]*

Table 37i—SA-TEK-Reponse message attributes

**Security Negotiation Parameters | Describes requesting MS's security capabilities (see 11.8.4)***In 6.3.2.3.23 SS basic capability request (SBC-REQ) message**[Insert at the end of 6.3.2.3.23:]*Security Negotiation Parameters (see ~~11.8.7~~ **11.8.4**)*In 6.3.2.3.24 SS basic capability response (SBC-RSP) message*

*[Insert at the end of 6.3.2.3.24:]*

Security Negotiation Parameters (see ~~44.8.7~~ 11.8.4)

7.8.1 SA-TEK 3-way handshake

*[Add at the end of step 3]*

The MS must include, through the Security Negotiation Parameters attribute, the security capabilities that it included in the SBC-REQ message during the basic capabilities negotiation phase.

*[Add at the end of step 4]*

In addition, the BS must verify the MS's security capabilities encoded in the Security Negotiation Parameters attribute against the security capabilities provided by the MS through the SBC-REG message. If security capabilities don't match, the BS should log the problem.

*[Add at the end of step 5]*

In addition, the BS must include, through the Security Negotiation Parameters attribute, the security capabilities that it wishes to specify for the session with the MS (these will generally be the same as the ones insecurely negotiated in SBC-REQ/RSP).

*[Add at the end of step 6]*

The MS also must verify the BS's security capabilities encoded in the Security Negotiation Parameters attribute against the security capabilities provided by the BS through the SBC-RSP message. If security capabilities don't match, the MS should log the problem.

*In 11.8.4 Security Negotiation Parameters, add the following two messages to the "scope" box:*

**SA-TEK-Request, SA-TEK-Response**

#### **Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*In 6.3.2.3.9.18 SA-TEK-Request message*

*[Insert into table 37h the following row before the last CMAC row]*

Table 37h—SA-TEK-Request message attributes

**Security Negotiation Parameters | Describes requesting MS's security capabilities (see 11.8.4)**

*In 6.3.2.3.9.19 SA-TEK-Response message*

*[Insert into the table 37i the following row ]*

Table 37i—SA-TEK-Reponse message attributes

**Security Negotiation Parameters** | Describes requesting MS's security capabilities (see 11.8.4)

*In 6.3.2.3.23 SS basic capability request (SBC-REQ) message*

*[Insert at the end of 6.3.2.3.23:]*

Security Negotiation Parameters (see ~~4.8.7~~ 11.8.4)

*In 6.3.2.3.24 SS basic capability response (SBC-RSP) message*

*[Insert at the end of 6.3.2.3.24:]*

Security Negotiation Parameters (see ~~4.8.7~~ 11.8.4)

7.8.1 SA-TEK 3-way handshake

[Add at the end of step 3]

The MS must include, through the Security Negotiation Parameters attribute, the security capabilities that it included in the SBC-REQ message during the basic capabilities negotiation phase.

[Add at the end of step 4]

In addition, the BS must verify the MS's security capabilities encoded in the Security Negotiation Parameters attribute against the security capabilities provided by the MS through the SBC-REQ message. If security capabilities don't match, the BS should log the problem.

[Add at the end of step 5]

In addition, the BS must include, through the Security Negotiation Parameters attribute, the security capabilities that it wishes to specify for the

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

Change to Table 37h SA-TEK-Request message attributes appears to be a near duplicate of the existing row.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5136**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
		55	43	37h	6.3.2.3.9.18

The AKID in the SA-TEK-Response is redundant -- the AK used by the MS in the CMAC/HMAC tuple must match the AKID supplied by the BS in the SA-TEK-Challenge message or SA-TEK-Challenge tuple.

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the AKID attribute.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Nothing here is broken. The overhead of using AKID is minimal and it is useful for synchronizing the 3 way handshake.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5137**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
		55	43	37i	6.3.2.3.9.19

The AKID in the SA-TEK-Response is redundant -- the AK used by the BS in the CMAC/HMAC tuple must match the AKID supplied by the BS in the SA-TEK-Challenge message or SA-TEK-Challenge tuple

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the AKID attribute.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Nothing here is broken. The overhead of using AKID is minimal and it is useful for synchronizing the 3 way handshake.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5138**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **55** Starting Line # **49** Fig/Table# **37i** Section **6.3.2.3.9.19**

According to the accepted comment #4070 (contribution C802.16-05/231r2), SA-Descriptor(s) should be an attribute in the SA-TEK-Response message but it's not reflected correctly.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert a row in Table 37i

(one or more) SA-Descriptor(s) | Each compound SA-Descriptor attribute specifies an SA identifier (SAID) and additional properties of the SA. This attribute is present at the initial network entry.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

[See comment 5134](#)**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment 5134](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5139**

Comment submitted by: **Haixiang**

**He**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type

Starting Page # **55**

Starting Line # **54**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.9.20**

SA TEK Update is a TLV (§11.7.21), not a message.

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete this section.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5134

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

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

See comment #5134

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5140**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **55**

Starting Line # **54**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.9.20**

The SA-TEK-Update is no longer a message but a TLV which is already defined in section 11.7.21.

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the whole section 6.3.2.3.9.20

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5134

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

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

See comment #5134

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5141**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **55** Starting Line # **55** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.9.20**

SA-TEK update TLV were omitted from SA-TEK-Response message.

It was defined and accepted in session #35 but was not inserted, it must be defined in the standard to use SA-TEK Response message.

**Suggested Remedy**

Contribbution C80216e-05\_286.doc

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**

**Recommendation by**

In Table 370

Replace the last row

46-255| reserved

with two rows

48 | SA TEK Update

49-255| reserved

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

In Table 370

Replace the last row

46-255| reserved

with two rows

48 | SA TEK Update

49-255| reserved

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

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

SA-TEK update TLV is already part of the SA-TEK-Response message. Part of this comment is superceded by #5134. Remaining is provided here.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

Entry 47 is not accounted for. I changed the reserved bits to be 47-255 rather than what was indicated in this comment.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5142**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon**

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **56** Starting Line # **48**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.9.20**

The name of term, "OMAC," is changed to "CMAC."

Therefore, "OMAC\_\*" should be changed to "CMAC\_\*" over whole text in the P802.16e/D8.

**Suggested Remedy**

Therefore, "OMAC\_\*" should be changed to "CMAC\_\*" over whole text in the P802.16e/D8.

For instance,  
 OMAC\_PN\_\* => CMAC\_PN\_\*  
 OMAC\_KEY\_D => CMAC\_KEY\_D  
 OMAC\_KEY\_U => CMAC\_KEY\_U  
 and so on.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Therefore, "OMAC\_\*" should be changed to "CMAC\_\*" over whole text in the P802.16e/D8.

For instance,  
 OMAC\_PN\_\* => CMAC\_PN\_\*  
 OMAC\_KEY\_D => CMAC\_KEY\_D  
 OMAC\_KEY\_U => CMAC\_KEY\_U  
 and so on.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5143**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **56**

Starting Line # **48**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.2.3.9.20**

Although it was decided to replace all "OMAC" with "CMAC", there is still mixture between these 2 words

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace all "OMAC" in the text with "CMAC"

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5142

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Superceded**

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

See comment #5142

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5144**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon**

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	60	Starting Line #	1	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.9.26
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	--------------

The GKEK needs to encrypt the GTEK for the MBRA. To operate the GKEK generally, security sublayer has to maintain GKEK lifetime and GKEK sequence number which are different from GTEK lifetime and GTEK sequence number.

Therefore, it is necessary to define GKEK lifetime and GKEK sequence number.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/278.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Accept contribution 802.16e-05/278 with following modifications:

In contribution section 11.9.30 Key Push Modes

1. Modify the second table first row with

Key Sequence Number | ~~Yes~~ AK Sequence Number | ~~No~~ GKEK Sequence Number.

2. In text below the second table, modify:

~~AK's Key-Sequence-Number, GSAID, Key Push Modes, ...~~

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Accept contribution 802.16e-05/278 with following modifications:

In contribution section 11.9.30 Key Push Modes

1. Modify the second table first row with

Key Sequence Number | ~~Yes~~ AK Sequence Number | ~~No~~ GKEK Sequence Number.

2. In text below the second table, modify:

~~AK's Key-Sequence-Number, GSAID, Key Push Modes, ...~~

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

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Contribution C802.16e-05/278 contains serious omissions in the last paragraph. It appears as though parts of words (and certainly parts of the paragraph) are missing. Please have a close look at the result (the text below the new GKEK\_Parameters subattributes table) and provide text to clean it up.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5145**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment            Type Editorial, Satisfied (was            Starting Page # **60**            Starting Line # **2**            Fig/Table#            Section **6.3.2.3.9.26**

DVJ46(subclause=6.3.2.3.9.26,page=60,line=2):  
Inconsistent capitalization.

Suggested Remedy

Make subclause and table consistent.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Make subclause and table consistent.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5146**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **60** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.9.26**

DVJ47(subclause=6.3.2.3.9.26,page=60,line=5):  
"This message" refers to previous text, not the subclause.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the first sentence self-contained.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Make the first sentence self-contained.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions e) editor disagrees

This resolution is unclear.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5147**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **61** Starting Line # **9**Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.9.27**

1. Correct code number based on the Table 26.
2. Renumber a table of contents.
3. Rename some messages defined in the PKMv2. In other words, add the term "PKMv2."

**Suggested Remedy**~~6.3.2.3.9.27 EAP Start~~

6.3.2.3.9.15 PKMv2 EAP Start message

When an MSS has to initiate ~~an authentication process~~ an EAP-based authorization procedure or an authenticated EAP-based authorization procedure with a BS, it sends ~~an~~ a PKMv2 EAP Start message.

Code: ~~29~~ 17

This message has no attribute.

Proposed Resolution  
See comment #5128

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment #5128

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5148**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	61	Starting Line #	10	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.9.27
EAP start / Transfer clarification									

In re-authentication case EAP-Start and EAP transfer should be protected with OMAC/HMAC in order to prevent denial of service attack. Also EAP start should be used for SS initiated re-authentication only

**Suggested Remedy**

*In Table 26—PKM message codes*  
Remove message type 29 EAP start

*In Section 6.3.2.3.9.27 do the following changes*

6.3.2.3.9.27 PKMv2 EAP start

~~This message shall be used by the MSS to trigger re-authentication When an MSS has to initiate an authentication process with a BS, it sends an EAP start message.~~

Code: 2917

~~This message has no attribute.~~

Attributes are shown in Table xxx

[copy "Key Sequence Number" and "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " attributes from table 37k]

6.3.2.3.9.15 PKMv2 EAP Transfer message

When an MS has an EAP message received from an EAP method for transmission to the BS or when a BS has an EAP message received from an EAP method for transmission to the MS, it encapsulates it in a PKMv2 EAP Transfer message.

In re-authentication case "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " and "Key Sequence Number" attributes shall be presented.

Code: 17

Attributes are shown in Table 37e.

[copy and add "Key Sequence Number" and "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " attributes from table 37k]

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**

**Recommendation by**

*In Section 6.3.2.3.9.27 PKMv2 EAP Start do the following changes*

In the case of EAP re-authentication, using EAP methods deriving keys, "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " and "Key Sequence Number" attributes shall be included.

~~This message has no attribute.~~—Attributes are shown in Table below.

*Insert an attribute table:*

Table 37x : PKMv2 EAP-Start attributes

*[copy "Key Sequence Number" and "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " attribute rows from table 37k into this table]*

*In 6.3.2.3.9.15 PKMv2 EAP Transfer message add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph.*

*In the case of re-authentication, "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " and "Key Sequence Number" attributes shall be included.*

*[copy and add "Key Sequence Number" and "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " attributes from table 37k into 37e]*

*Add to the end of 7.1.3.2 PKM EAP Authentication*

*During re-authentication, the EAP transfer messages are protected with an HMAC/CMAC tuple. The BS and MS must discard unprotected EAP transfer messages, or EAP transfer messages with invalid HMAC/CMAC digests during re-authentication.*

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

*In Section 6.3.2.3.9.27 PKMv2 EAP Start do the following changes*

*In the case of EAP re-authentication, using EAP methods deriving keys, "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " and "Key Sequence Number" attributes shall be included.*

*~~This message has no attribute.~~—Attributes are shown in Table below.*

*Insert an attribute table:*

Table 37x : PKMv2 EAP-Start attributes

*[copy "Key Sequence Number" and "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " attribute rows from table 37k into this table]*

*In 6.3.2.3.9.15 PKMv2 EAP Transfer message add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph.*

*In the case of re-authentication, "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " and "Key Sequence Number" attributes shall be included.*

*[copy and add "Key Sequence Number" and "HMAC Digest/CMAC Digest " attributes from table 37k into 37e]*

*Add to the end of 7.1.3.2 PKM EAP Authentication*

*During re-authentication, the EAP transfer messages are protected with an HMAC/CMAC tuple. The BS and MS must discard unprotected EAP transfer messages, or EAP transfer messages with invalid HMAC/CMAC digests during re-authentication.*

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5149**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	61	Starting Line #	24	Fig/Table#	Section
Reference clarification								

Suggested Remedy  
Change

Security Negotiation Parameters (see ~~11.7.8~~ 11.8.7)

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by  
Change

Security Negotiation Parameters (see ~~11.8.4~~ 11.8.7)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**  
Change

Security Negotiation Parameters (see ~~11.8.4~~ 11.8.7)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions  none needed

Dupe? This appears to have been covered by another comment.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5150**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	61	Starting Line #	33	Fig/Table#	Tabl	Section	6.3.2.3.26
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	------	---------	------------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: Again, inappropriate SS to MS changes from the 802.16-2004 documents that would remove necessary specification for 802.16-2004 compliant SS breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR.

Simple remedy is to change the MS back to SS where appropriate in the Table.

Also, in Action Code 2 actions, correcting improper Action Code response to resume Normal Operation specified. Says '0x00' but should be '02 or 03'.

#### Suggested Remedy

Accept Contribution C802.16e-05/273r0

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Insert the following editorial instruction (before the text and table):

*[Change the title of Table 55 as indicated:]*

"Table 55 -- Action codes and actions for an SS"

*[Insert the following text before Table 55:]*

"The BS and SS shall use the action codes defined in Table 55 if the agreed MAC version value supported on the channel is less than 5 in TLV number 148 (see section 11.1.3)."

Adopt the text in Table 55 from Contribution C802.16e-05/273r1 as a new Table 55a: "Action codes and actions for an MS".

*[Insert the following text before Table 55a:]*

"The BS and SS shall use the action codes defined in Table 55a if the agreed MAC version value supported on the channel is equal to 5 in TLV number 148 (see section 11.1.3)."

Change 'SS' to 'MS' in the first 5 entries of the new Table 55a.

**Reason for Recommendation**

Codes 0x0 through 0x4 are legacy and cannot be deleted or changed without undermining backwards compatibility, which would be out-of-scope of the 16e PAR. So no changes are being made to Action Codes 00-04. The adopted resolution of this comment resolves the "conflict" between the Action Codes required for fixed subscribers and mobile subscribers.

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Insert the following editorial instruction (before the text and table):

*[Change the title of Table 55 as indicated:]*

"Table 55 -- Action codes and actions for an SS"

*[Insert the following text before Table 55:]*

"The BS and SS shall use the action codes defined in Table 55 if the agreed MAC version value supported on the channel is less than 5 in TLV number 148 (see section 11.1.3)."

Adopt the text in Table 55 from Contribution C802.16e-05/273r1 as a new Table 55a: "Action codes and actions for an MS".

*[Insert the following text before Table 55a:]*

"The BS and SS shall use the action codes defined in Table 55a if the agreed MAC version value supported on the channel is equal to 5 in TLV number 148 (see section 11.1.3)."

Change 'SS' to 'MS' in the first 5 entries of the new Table 55a.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5151**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **61** Starting Line # **43** Fig/Table# **55** Section **6.3.2.3.26**

The standard allows several options around the DREG-CMD message which are not clearly defined, nor is their use-case clear at all. DREG-CMD should be used to force an MSS to de-register from the network; additionally, a special DREG-CMD should be used for Idle mode initiation (DREG = 0x5). The other DREG codes are redundant and unclear:

0x0 = [OK, normal deregistration]

0x1 = MSS shall wait for DREG-0x0 (which means that MSS should de-register anyway!). Unclear; erroneous definition; suggest to remove

0x2 = MSS shall only transmit on non-transport CIDs. This is in contrast to the QoS model of Service Flows. Unclear use-case; suggest to remove.

0x3 = MSS shall return to normal operation. Unclear use-case. Suggest to remove.

0x4 = In response to MSS DREG-REQ. This should be merged with DREG-0x0 as they both lead to the same MSS behavior. Suggest to merge with 0x0.

0x5 = Idle mode operation.

0x6 = The MSS shall retransmit DREG-REQ. Unclear use-case. Suggest to remove.

0x7 = The MSS shall not retransmit DREG-REQ. Unclear use-case. Suggest to remove.

#### Suggested Remedy

Specific changes in the standard:

**[Change in section 6.3.2.3.26]**

[Change in Table 55]

Remove the following lines (actions):

~~0x01~~

~~0x02~~

~~0x03~~

~~0x06~~

~~0x07~~

Change in line 0x04: [same as 0x00](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5150](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    [l\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5152**

Comment submitted by: [Vladimir](#)

[Yanover](#)

[Member](#)

[2005/06/08](#)

Comment            Type [Technical, Non-binding](#)            Starting Page # [61](#)            Starting Line # [45](#)

Fig/Table#

Section

[BS may just choose another way to contiue after DREG-CMD issued](#)

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution            Recommendation: [Withdrawn](#)                      Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group                      Decision of Group: [Withdrawn](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    [l\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5153**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **61** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# Section

Clarification: not in all cases BS respond this way

**Suggested Remedy**

MS- shall terminate current Normal Operations with the BS; the BS shall transmit this action code only in response to any a MS DREG-REQ message.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 5150

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5154**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **63** Starting Line # **37** Fig/Table# Tabl Section **6.3.2.3.42**  
 I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarassment to the membership.

Problem: Again, inappropriate SS to MS changes from the 802.16-2004 documents that would remove necessary specification for 802.16-2004 compliant SS breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR.

Simple remedy is to change the MS back to SS where appropriate in the Table.

**Suggested Remedy**

Accept Contribution C802.16e-05/274r0

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Accept Contribution C802.16e-05/274r0

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Accept Contribution C802.16e-05/274r0

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5155**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	66	Starting Line #	30	Fig/Table#	Tabl	Section	6.3.2.3.43.5
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	------	---------	--------------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: Changes to all of 6.6.3.2.3.43.5 as they stand to be implemented through this 16e amendment, would make retroactive changes to 802.16-2004 compliant SS without any appropriate mechanism to distinguish SS supporting only the 802.16-2004 original iteration and SS supporting the 802.16-2004 PLUS the amended, non-MS centric, changes of 16e, breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR. This is a real problem.

Simple remedy is to make the IE change to the Table specific to MS.

#### Suggested Remedy

Accept Contribution C802.16e-05/275r0

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Accept Contribution C802.16e-05/275r0

The correct table reference should be Table 95, CQICH Control IE. The correct page/line numbers should be page 97, lines 14-16, lines 25-29.

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Accept Contribution C802.16e-05/275r0

The correct table reference should be Table 95, CQICH Control IE. The correct page/line numbers should be page 97, lines 14-16, lines 25-29.

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

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5156**

Comment submitted by: [David](#)

[Castelow](#)

[Member](#)

[2005/06/08](#)

Comment Type [Technical, Non-binding](#)

Starting Page # [67](#)

Starting Line # [39](#)

Fig/Table# [95a](#)

Section [6.3.2.3.43.5](#)

[No units specified for entries in table 95a  
Probably meant to be dB.](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Add units at page 67, line 39](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: [Accepted-Modified](#)

Recommendation by

[Change "CINR" to "CINR \(dB\)".](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: [Accepted-Modified](#)

[Change "CINR" to "CINR \(dB\)".](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5157**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	67	Starting Line #	59	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.43.6
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: Changes to all of 6.3.2.3.43.6.1&.2&.3 are certainly more properly Corrigenda items. The changes, as they stand to be implemented through this 16e amendment, would make retroactive changes to 802.16-2004 compliant SS without any appropriate mechanism to distinguish SS supporting only the 802.16-2004 original iteration and SS supporting the 802.16-2004 PLUS the amended, non-MS centric, changes of 16e. This is a real problem, breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR.

I looked at a remedy for this for a long time, and I cannot see a way to make changes to the proposed revisions, keeping the revised features, and maintain backwards compatibility/not disrupt legacy SS function. The answer is certainly to process these as Corrigenda items; not as 16e amendments. Note that some of these changes duplicate, or supersede changes to the Corrigenda D3 document.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[Delete page 67, line 62 through page 72, line 56, including the editorial instructions; and remand material to Corrigenda]*

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

#### Reason for Recommendation

Until such time as corrigenda makes a change, these changes are required for 802.16e. Should corrigenda adopt this, we will remove it from 802.16e.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

Until such time as corrigenda makes a change, these changes are required for 802.16e. Should corrigenda adopt this, we will remove it from 802.16e.

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

Monitor corrigenda group to determine the status of this change.

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5158**

Comment submitted by: David

Castelow

Member

2005/06/08

Comment      Type **Editorial**      Starting Page # **68**      Starting Line # **20**      Fig/Table#      Section **6.3.2.3.43.6.1**  
 Use of if cases such as "Generic" is messy: use the numerical representation, especially as the table 333c does not define "Generic". Is this meant to be "Generic Chase"?

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace "Generic" and "CTC IR" with values 1 and 0 respectively in Tables 96, 97, 98.  
 Or follow Table 101b where the names match those in 333c.

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**      **Recommendation by**  
 In Tables 96, 97, 98, 102, 103, 104 make the following changes:

...

```
if (HARQ mode = 0"CTC IR") {            |            —            |            CTC IR
...
} else if (HARQ mode = 1"Generic") {    |            —            |            Generic Chase
```

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**  
 In Tables 96, 97, 98, 102, 103, 104 make the following changes:

...

```
if (HARQ mode = 0"CTC IR") {            |            —            |            CTC IR
...
} else if (HARQ mode = 1"Generic") {    |            —            |            Generic Chase
```

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**



Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16e/D8

Ballot Number: 0001045

Comment Date

Comment # 5159 Comment submitted by: David V. James Member 2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 71 Starting Line # 20 Fig/Table# Section 6.3.2.3.43.6.3

DVJ48(subclause=6.3.2.3.43.6.3,page=71,line=20): Excess subclauses.

Suggested Remedy

- 1) Make format correct, with space after number.
2) Plan for eliminating, 5th level is the maximum legal level.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

- 1) Make format correct, with space after number.
2) Plan for eliminating, 5th level is the maximum legal level.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5160**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**Starting Page # **73**Starting Line # **27**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.2.3.43.6.7**

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: These changes are a bit more interesting. They relate to the new Map added in 6.3.2.3.43.6.7, so not really Corrigenda related, but, as they stand to be implemented through this 16e amendment, would make retroactive changes to 802.16-2004 compliant SS without any appropriate mechanism to distinguish SS supporting only the 802.16-2004 original iteration and SS supporting the 802.16-2004 PLUS the amended, non-MS centric, changes of 16e. This is a real problem, breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR.

Remedy would normally be to provide guiding language specifying that BS not use the new Maps when legacy SS are present and use of the Maps would cause the legacy SS to fail to perform. SS not supporting the new, optional Maps would simply ignore the new map types, not intended for them anyway, and it would remove implied retroactive specification.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[In 6.3.2.3.43.6.7 MIMO Compact\_DL-MAP IE format, page 74, line 5, add new paragraph before Table 101b as:]*

'BS shall not configure and transmit MIMO Compact DL-MAP IE or SDMA Compact DL-MAP IE such that SS currently attached to the BS but not supporting this feature would fail to properly read the message and thereby fail to perform.'

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

*[In 6.3.2.3.43.6.7 MIMO Compact\_DL-MAP IE format, page 74, line 5, add new paragraph before Table 101b as:]*

'BS shall not configure and transmit MIMO Compact DL-MAP IE or SDMA Compact DL-MAP IE such that SS currently attached to the BS but not supporting this feature would fail to properly read the message and thereby fail to perform.'

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

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

This is an optional feature and it is unreasonable to expect the SS to be able to decode a message for an option which it is not capable of supporting. However, the MIMO definition in the standard allows a SISO user to be supported in its definition. The same can be said of SDMA. Units incapable of supporting a feature would always "fail to perform".

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5161**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ49(subclause=6.3.2.3.43.6.7,page=73,line=33): Bad spelling**

Starting Page # **73**

Starting Line # **33**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.43.6.7**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Sub-frame**

**==>**

**subframe**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

**Sub-frame**

**==>**

**subframe**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5162**

Comment submitted by: **David**

**Castelow**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **75** Starting Line # **18** Fig/Table# **101** Section **6.3.2.3.43.6.7**

Provide explanation of terms "Nep" and "Nsch". Also consider using all capitals for these variables, as appears elsewhere.

**Suggested Remedy**

Include definition of Nep and Nsch.  
throughout, replace Nep by N<sub>EP</sub>  
Throughout, replace Nsch by N<sub>SCH</sub>.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Include definition of Nep and Nsch.  
throughout, replace Nep by N<sub>EP</sub>  
Throughout, replace Nsch by N<sub>SCH</sub>.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5163**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **76** Starting Line # **22** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.43.6.7**

The 802.16e/D8 defines DIUC-CQI of CQICH Type field used for Closed loop MIMO control. However, this scheme is not clarified well in text. Therefore DIUC-CQI scheme shall be clarified.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[add the text in line 19, page 78, setction 6.3.2.3.43.6.7]*

**DIUC-CQI**

when Feedback Type is 0b000-0b010, DIUC-CQI Fast-feedback slot contains 48 bits (including CRC of 16 bits) modulated by QPSK with CTC(coding rate 1/2).

feedback information consists of mode\_indication 4 bits, number\_of\_feedback 3 bits and feedback\_data 25 bits.

mode_indication (4bits)	number_or_feedback (3bits)	feedback_data (total 25bits)
0b0000	N	prefered Band Index (5bits) , 5*N bits
0b0001	N	measured power for prefered Band(5bits) ,5*N bits
0b0010	N	measured power for n th Pilot pattern(5bits) ,5*N bits
0b0011	N	measured power for n th stream(5bits) ,5*N bits
0b0100	N	perfered DIUC for n th stream(4bits) ,4*N bitsN
0b0101	N	perfered UIUC for n th stream(4bits) ,4*N bitsN

*[delete the text within table 302a in line 54-55, page 348, setction 8.4.5.4.15]*

~~— A DIUC-CQI is a CQI channel that uses a modulation and coding level derived from the DIUC.~~

*[add the text in line 53, page 349, setction 8.4.5.4.15]*

**DIUC-CQI**

when Feedback Type is 0b000-0b010, DIUC-CQI Fast-feedback slot contains 48 bits (including CRC of 16 bits) modulated by QPSK with CTC(coding rate 1/2).

feedback information consists of mode\_indication 4 bits, number\_of\_feedback 3 bits and feedback\_data 25 bits specified in 6.3.2.3.43.6.7.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

[add the text in line 19, page 78, setction 6.3.2.3.43.6.7]

DIUC-CQI

when Feedback Type is 0b000-0b010, DIUC-CQI Fast-feedback slot contains 48 bits (including CRC of 16 bits) modulated by QPSK with CTC(coding rate 1/2).

feedback information consists of mode\_indication 4 bits, number\_of\_feedback 3 bits and feedback\_data 25 bits.

mode_indication (4bits)	number_or_feedback (3bits)	feedback_data (total 25bits)
0b0000	N	preferred Band Index (5bits) , 5*N bits
0b0001	N	measured power for prefered Band(5bits) ,5*N bits
0b0010	N	measured power for n th Pilot pattern(5bits) ,5*N bits
0b0011	N	measured power for n th stream(5bits) ,5*N bits
0b0100	N	preferred DIUC for n th stream(4bits) ,4*N bitsN
0b0101	N	preferred UIUC for n th stream(4bits) ,4*N bitsN

[delete the text within table 302a in line 54-55, page 348, setction 8.4.5.4.15]

~~A DIUC-CQI is a CQI channel that uses a modulation and coding level derived from the DIUC.~~

[add the text in line 53, page 349, setction 8.4.5.4.15]

DIUC-CQI

when Feedback Type is 0b000-0b010, DIUC-CQI Fast-feedback slot contains 48 bits (including CRC of 16 bits) modulated by QPSK with CTC(coding rate 1/2).

feedback information consists of mode\_indication 4 bits, number\_of\_feedback 3 bits and feedback\_data 25 bits specified in 6.3.2.3.43.6.7.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

Remove DIUC-CQI material from the document:

In Table 101b, line 21 CQICH Usage, change the 3 bits to Reserved.  
In Table 302a, line 48 CQICH Type, change 3 bits to Reserved., also delete lines 54, 55.

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

DIUC-CQI is indeed not defined, nor is it clear what it is used for or how to implement it.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5164**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was**

Starting Page # **76**

Starting Line # **34**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.43.6.7**

DVJ51(subclause=6.3.2.3.43.6.7,page=76,line=34):  
Spelling.

**Suggested Remedy**

filed  
==>  
field

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

filed  
==>  
field

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5165**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	76	Starting Line #	38	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.43.6.7
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	----------------

DVJ50(subclause=6.3.2.3.43.6.7,page=76,line=38):  
This code is unreal.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Use variable on left side of assignment.
- 2) Define the language somewhere.
- OR
- 3) Describe this in another table.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Re-write the table to move the code below the table up into the table. Clause editors have been assigned this task.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

Masoud Olfat to provide the new table, in FrameMaker format, by June 23 2005.

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5166**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	77	Starting Line #	55	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.43.6.7
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	----------------

DVJ52(subclause=6.3.2.3.43.6.7,page=77,line=55):  
Inconsistent notation

**Suggested Remedy**

0bNNN notation for binary,  
here and throughout.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

0bNNN notation for binary,  
here and throughout.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5167**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	78	Starting Line #	17	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.43.6.7
Clean up text on per-stream power control									

**Suggested Remedy**

Page 78: line 17

Delete ---> 101 = Per stream power control  
Change ---> 101 ~ 111 = Reserved

Page 308: line 16

Delete ---> 110 = Per stream power control  
Change ---> 110~111 = Reserved

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Page 78: line 17

Delete ---> 101 = Per stream power control  
Change ---> 110 ~ 111 = Reserved

Page 308: line 16

Delete ---> 110 = Per stream power control  
Change ---> 110~111 = Reserved

In Table 302a line 41, remove 0b110 Per stream power control and add 0b110 to the reserved bits.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Page 78: line 17

Delete ---> 101 = Per stream power control  
Change ---> 110 ~ 111 = Reserved

Page 308: line 16

Delete ---> 110 = Per stream power control

Change ---> 110~111 = Reserved

In Table 302a line 41, remove 0b110 Per stream power control and add 0b110 to the reserved bits.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5168**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	82	Starting Line #	47	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.43.7
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarassment to the membership.

Problem: Same problem as in 6.3.2.3.43.6. Changes to all of 6.3.2.3.43.7.1&.2&.3 are certainly more properly Corrigenda items. The changes, as they stand to be implemented through this 16e amendment, would make retroactive changes to 802.16-2004 compliant SS without any appropriate mechanism to distinguish SS supporting only the 802.16-2004 original iteration and SS supporting the 802.16-2004 PLUS the amended, non-MS centric, changes of 16e. This is a real problem, breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR.

I looked at a remedy for this for a long time, and I cannot see a way to make changes to the proposed revisions, keeping the revised features, and maintain backwards compatibility/not disrupt legacy SS function. The answer is certainly to process these as Corrigenda items; not as 16e amendments. Note that some of these changes duplicate, or supersede changes to the Corrigenda D3 document.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[Delete page 82, line 50 through page 86, line 55, including the editorial instructions; and remand material to Corrigenda]*

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

#### Reason for Recommendation

Until such time as corrigenda makes a change, these changes are required for 802.16e. Should corrigenda adopt this, we will remove it from 802.16e.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

Until such time as corrigenda makes a change, these changes are required for 802.16e. Should corrigenda adopt this, we will remove it from 802.16e.

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) [none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5169**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	87	Starting Line #	38	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.43.7.8
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	----------------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarassment to the membership.

Problem: These changes are a bit more interesting. They relate to the new Map added in 6.3.2.3.43.7.8, so not really Corrigenda related, but, as they stand to be implemented through this 16e amendment, would make retroactive changes to 802.16-2004 compliant SS without any appropriate mechanism to distinguish SS supporting only the 802.16-2004 original iteration and SS supporting the 802.16-2004 PLUS the amended, non-MS centric, changes of 16e. This is a real problem, breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR.

Remedy would normally be to provide guiding language specifying that BS not use the new Maps when legacy SS are present and use of the Maps would cause the legacy SS to fail to perform. SS not supporting the new, optional Maps would simply ignore the new map types, not intended for them anyway, and it would remove implied retroactive specification.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[In 6.3.2.3.43.7.8 MIMO Compact UL MAP IE format, page 88, line 2, add new paragraph before Table 108a as:]*

'BS shall not configure and transmit MIMO Compact UL-MAP IE or SDMA Compact UL-MAP IE such that SS currently attached to the BS but not supporting this feature would fail to properly read the message and thereby fail to perform.'

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This is an optional feature and it is unreasonable to expect the SS to be able to decode a message for an option which it is not capable of supporting. However, the MIMO definition in the standard allows a SISO user to be supported in its definition. The same can be said of SDMA.



**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

Units incapable of supporting a feature would always "fail to perform".

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    [1\) none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5170**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **90** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# **108c** Section **6.3.2.3.44**

Whereas Table 108c in 6.3.2.3.44 lists the type of a MOB\_SLP-REQ as 51, whereas Table 14 in 6.3.2.3 of draft 8 lists the number 50, Number 51 is used for MOB\_SLP-RSP.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the type value in Table 108c as follows:

"Management message type = 5~~4~~0"

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change the type value in Table 108c as follows:

"Management message type = 5~~4~~0"

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change the type value in Table 108c as follows:

"Management message type = 5~~4~~0"

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5171**

Comment submitted by: Victor

Stolpman

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding** Starting Page # **90** Starting Line # **47** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.47**  
 ertPS is missing.

**Suggested Remedy**  
 Add a bit for ertPS.

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by  
 On Page 100, make the following change:

Scheduling Service Supported | 48 | Bitmap to indicate if BS supports a particular scheduling service. 1 indicates support, 0 indicates not support:  
 bit 0: Unsolicited Grant Service (UGS)  
 bit 1: Real-time Polling Service (rtPS)  
 bit 2: Non-real-time Polling service (nrtPS)  
 bit 3: Best Effort value of 0b0000 indicates no information on service available  
 bit 4: Extended real-time Polling Service (ertPS)  
 bits 5-7: *Reserved*

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On Page 100, make the following change:

Scheduling Service Supported | 48 | Bitmap to indicate if BS supports a particular scheduling service. 1 indicates support, 0 indicates not support:  
 bit 0: Unsolicited Grant Service (UGS)  
 bit 1: Real-time Polling Service (rtPS)  
 bit 2: Non-real-time Polling service (nrtPS)  
 bit 3: Best Effort value of 0b0000 indicates no information on service available  
 bit 4: Extended real-time Polling Service (ertPS)  
 bits 5-7: *Reserved*  
Reserved | 4 | Shall be set to zero.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: <b>P802.16e/D8</b>	Ballot Number: <b>0001045</b>	Comment Date
Comment # <b>5172</b>	Comment submitted by: <b>David V. James</b>	Member
		2005/06/08

Comment	Type <b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	Starting Page # <b>91</b>	Starting Line # <b>27</b>	Fig/Table#	Section <b>6.3.2.3.44</b>
<b>DVJ53(subclause=6.3.2.3.44,page=91,line=27):</b>					
<b>Inconsistent.</b>					

**Suggested Remedy**  
List the lowest values first, here and throughout.

**Proposed Resolution**                      **Recommendation:**                      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: <b>Accepted</b></b>
List the lowest values first, here and throughout.	

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

**Group's Notes**  
**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5173**

Comment submitted by: Mo-Han

Fong

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **91** Starting Line # **40** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.44**

I object to the text change in D8 corresponding to page 91, lines 41-43 because definition for a particular Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID may have been previously defined and the purpose of MS sending the MOB\_SLP-REQ is just to activate/de-activate the previously defined Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Make the following text change on page 91, lines 40-43]*

This ID may be used in further MOB\_SLP-REQ/RSP messages for activation / deactivation of Power Saving Class. ~~In case Definition = 0 Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID has no meaning and should be encoded as 0.~~

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[Make the following text change on page 91, lines 40-43]*

This ID may be used in further MOB\_SLP-REQ/RSP messages for activation / deactivation of Power Saving Class. ~~In case Definition = 0 Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID has no meaning and should be encoded as 0.~~

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[Make the following text change on page 91, lines 40-43]*

This ID may be used in further MOB\_SLP-REQ/RSP messages for activation / deactivation of Power Saving Class. ~~In case Definition = 0 Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID has no meaning and should be encoded as 0.~~

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5174**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **91** Starting Line # **41** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.44**

The note below Table 108c describing the Power\_saving\_Class\_ID of the RNG-REQ message is incorrect. The note states: "In case definition = 0 the Power\_saving\_Class\_ID has no meaning and should be encoded as 0". This text would imply that for activation/deactivation only of a PS Class the MS should not include the relevant Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID. Similarly, the text would imply that the MS shall include a value for the Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID for defining a PS Class but this value shall be assigned by the BS.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the note below the table as follows:

"In case Definition = ~~0~~**1** Power\_Saving\_Class\_ID has no meaning and should be encoded as 0."

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

[See comment 5173](#)

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5173](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5175**

Comment submitted by: **Victor**

**Stolpman**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **91**

Starting Line # **57** &

Fig/Table#

Section

Reference 6.3.19.2 is wrong.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change it to 6.3.20.2

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change it to 6.3.20.2

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change it to 6.3.20.2

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** c) instructions unclear

Where? There are 2 instances of 6.3.19.2. Change both? I can't be sure without a line number or a more clear description of the location of the problem.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5176**Comment submitted by: **Panyuh****Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **92** Starting Line # **4** Fig/Table# **108d** Section **6.3.2.3.45**  
Sleep mode needs some refinement.

**Suggested Remedy**

Discuss and adopt Contribution C80216e-05/270.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Discuss and adopt Contribution C80216e-05/270r1 with the following text change (see "Sleep Approved" description below the table):  
'In case of the MOB\_SLP-RSP transmitted from the BS in an unsolicited manner, the BS shall set "Sleep approved" = 1.'

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Discuss and adopt Contribution C80216e-05/270r1 with the following text change (see "Sleep Approved" description below the table):  
'In case of the MOB\_SLP-RSP transmitted from the BS in an unsolicited manner, the BS shall set "Sleep approved" = 1.'

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

Note that although C802.16e-05/270r1 had been uploaded, it was uploaded late and only contained the changes described above in the proposed resolution. For this reason, r0 was accepted and r1 was not considered.

**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions **k) done****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5177**

Comment submitted by: Victor

Stolpman

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **92**

Starting Line # **59**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.2.3.47**

ertPS is missing.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add a bit for ertPS.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Move text:

"A BS shall generate MOB\_NBR-ADV messages in the format shown in Table ." to a location immediately before Table 108f, fix the reference to the table.

Delete all of the descriptive text following table, right through to page 103 line 62.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Move text:

"A BS shall generate MOB\_NBR-ADV messages in the format shown in Table ." to a location immediately before Table 108f, fix the reference to the table.

Delete all of the descriptive text following table, right through to page 103 line 62.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions c) instructions unclear

I can't find this text.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5178**

Comment submitted by: Victor

Stolpman

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **93** Starting Line # **61** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.45**

SLPID should be optional and conditionally present, if FMT bit =0. As MOB\_PAG-ADV provides option for two formats: 1) with SLPID , 2) with Short CID. If a system chose not to implement SLPID, it would unnecessarily required to fill out SLPID.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace SLPID in with  
FMT 1 bit  
If FMT=0 {  
SLPID  
Reserved}.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superseded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment 5176](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5179**

Comment submitted by: Mo-Han

Fong

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **94** Starting Line # **14** Fig/Table# **108d** Section **6.3.2.3.45**

I object to the text change in the p802.16e/D8 regarding Table 108d 'Sleep-Response (MOB\_SLP-RSP) message format', because further clean up is required on the naming and description of the fields (lines 16-20).

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Modify Table 108d, page 94, lines 14-23 as follows]*

if (SHO or FBSS capability enabled) {	-	-	if SHO or FBSS capability is enabled in the REG-REQ/RSP message exchange
Maintain Active Set and Anchor <del>BS ID</del> BSID	1	-	
if (Maintained Active Set and Anchor <del>BS ID</del> BSID) {	3	-	
SHO/FBSS duration (s)	3	-	
}	-	-	
}	-	-	

*[Add the following definitions on page 95, line 64, after the CID definition description]*

Maintain Active Set and Anchor BSID

1: Active set and Anchor BS ID shall be maintained while in sleep mode for SHO/FBSS duration

0: Active set and Anchor BS ID shall not be maintained while in sleep mode

SHO/FBSS duration (s)

Active set and Anchor BS ID is maintained for 10x2<sup>n</sup>s frames after the Power Saving Class is activated.

*[Add a subsection 6.3.20.6 to describe the maintainence of SHO/FBSS active set in sleep mode. Add the following text to page 169, after line 65]*

*[Insert new subclause 6.3.20.6]*

6.3.20.6 SHO/FBSS Active Set Maintainence in Sleep Mode

An MSS in Sleep mode shall maintain the Active set and Anchor BS ID if at least one active Power Saving Class has the Maintain Active Set and Anchor BSID set to 1 and the SHO/FBSS duration as specified in the MOB\_SLP-RSP message has not expired. Before the SHO/FBSS duration expires, the MSS may continue to monitor the signal strength of neighbor BS and initiate deactivation of at least one Power Saving Class to keep in normal mode to perform Active Set update procedure (defined in Section 6.3.21.3.3) or Anchor BS update procedure (defined in Section 6.3.21.3.4).

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**      Recommendation by  
*[Modify Table 108d, page 94, lines 14-23 as follows]*

if (SHO or FBSS capability enabled) {	-	if SHO or FBSS capability is enabled in the REG-REQ/RSP message exchange
Maintain Active Set and Anchor <del>BS-ID</del> BSID	1	-
if (Maintained Active Set and Anchor <del>BS-ID</del> BSID) {	3	-
SHO/FBSS duration (s)	3	-
}	-	-
}	-	-

*[Add the following definitions on page 95, line 64, after the CID definition description]*

#### Maintain Active Set and Anchor BSID

1: Active set and Anchor BSID shall be maintained while in sleep mode for SHO/FBSS duration

0: Active set and Anchor BSID shall not be maintained while in sleep mode

#### SHO/FBSS duration (s)

Active set and Anchor BSID is maintained for  $10 \times 2^x$  frames after the Power Saving Class is activated.

*[Add a subsection 6.3.20.6 to describe the maintainence of SHO/FBSS active set in sleep mode. Add the following text to page 169, after line 65]*

#### [Insert new subclause 6.3.20.6]

#### 6.3.20.6 SHO/FBSS Active Set Maintainence in Sleep Mode

An MS in Sleep mode shall maintain the Active set and Anchor BSID if at least one active Power Saving Class has the Maintain Active Set and Anchor BSID set to 1 and the SHO/FBSS duration as specified in the MOB\_SLP-RSP message has not expired. Before the SHO/FBSS duration expires, the MS may continue to monitor the signal strength of neighbor BS and initiate deactivation of at least one Power Saving Class to keep in normal mode to perform Active Set update procedure (defined in Section 6.3.21.3.3) or Anchor BS update procedure (defined in Section 6.3.21.3.4).

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

[Modify Table 108d, page 94, lines 14-23 as follows]

if (SHO or FBSS capability enabled) {	-	if SHO or FBSS capability is enabled in the REG-REQ/RSP message exchange
Maintain Active Set and Anchor BS	1	-
if (Maintain Active Set and Anchor BS) {	3	-
SHO/FBSS duration (s)	3	-
}	-	-
}	-	-

[Add the following definitions on page 95, line 64, after the CID definition description]

Maintain Active Set and Anchor BS1: Active set and Anchor BS shall be maintained while in sleep mode for SHO/FBSS duration0: Active set and Anchor BS shall not be maintained while in sleep modeSHO/FBSS duration (s)Active set and Anchor BS shall be maintained for  $10 \times 2^{\text{exp}}(\text{s})$  frames after the Power Saving Class is activated.

[Add a subsection 6.3.20.6 to describe the maintainence of SHO/FBSS active set in sleep mode. Add the following text to page 169, after line 65]

[Insert new subclause 6.3.20.6]6.3.20.6 SHO/FBSS Active Set Maintainence in Sleep Mode

An MS in Sleep mode shall maintain the Active set and Anchor BS if at least one active Power Saving Class has the Maintain Active Set and Anchor BSID set to 1 and the SHO/FBSS duration as specified in the MOB\_SLP-RSP message has not expired. Before the SHO/FBSS duration expires, the MS may continue to monitor the signal strength of neighbor BS and initiate deactivation of at least one Power Saving Class to keep in normal mode to perform Active Set update procedure (defined in Section 6.3.21.3.3) or Anchor BS update procedure (defined in Section 6.3.21.3.4).

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Use superscript or math object to make the equation  $10 \times 2$  to the power of 'n'

Use superscript or main object to make the equation 10<sup>2</sup> to the power of 5

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: <b>P802.16e/D8</b>	Ballot Number: <b>0001045</b>	Comment Date
Comment # <b>5180</b>	Comment submitted by: Mark Cudak	Member
Comment Type Editorial	Starting Page # 95	Starting Line # 1
Typo	Fig/Table#	Section 6.3.2.3.45

Suggested Remedy

Change text as follows:  
"MAC frames): the MS"

Proposed Resolution                      Recommendation:                      Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group                      Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change text as follows:  
"MAC frames): the MS"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5181**

Comment submitted by: Victor

Stolpman

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Binding	95	43 &		

Reference 6.3.19.2 is wrong.

Suggested Remedy  
Change it to 6.3.20.2

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted** Recommendation by  
Change Reference 6.3.19.2 to 6.3.20.2

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
Change Reference 6.3.19.2 to 6.3.20.2

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions c) instructions unclear  
Where? Couldn't find it. Please try to provide a line number.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5182**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 96 Starting Line # 28 Fig/Table# 108e Section 6.3.2.3.46

The draft specifies in the text the use of either the SLPID- or the Short Basic CID method in the MOB\_TRF-IND message for addressing MSs in sleep mode. The choice for either of the options is supposed to be indicated with the FMT parameter. However, this functionality seems to be removed from the standard and the format of the MOB\_TRF-IND message as shown in Table 108e does neither include the FMT parameter nor the Short Basic CID.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

~~"There are two formats for the MOB\_TRF-IND message, indicated by the FMT field. When FMT=0, if the MS does not find its own SLPID-Group Indication bit-map or Traffic Indication bit-map to its SLPID in the MOB\_TRF-IND message, it will consider this as a negative indication and may continue its Sleep Mode. The MS shall update its SLPID if it finds its own Old\_New\_SLPID in SLPID\_Update TLV. When FMT=1, if the MS does not find its own Short Basic CID in the MOB\_TRF-IND message, it will consider this as a negative indication and may continue its Sleep Mode."~~

Remove description of the following (missing) fields below table 108e:

- \* FMT
- \* Num-pos
- \* Short Basic CID

Change text above SLPID\_Update as follows:

~~"When MOB\_TRF-IND message has FMT=0, it~~ may include the following TLV:"

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment 5176](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5183**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **97** Starting Line # **4**

Fig/Table# **108e** Section

Comment # 4092 (Yigal Leiba) was accepted by not impleneted

**Suggested Remedy**

Apply comment # 4092 (Yigal Leiba) to Table 108e

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superceded****

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

See comment 5176.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5184**

Comment submitted by: Victor

Stolpman

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Binding	97	14		6.3.2.3.46

The table is not in harmony with the fields explained after the table. It is only defined for FMT=0 case.

**Suggested Remedy**

Need to introduce FMT field after line 13. Need to correct the structure in the table: If FMT=0 {SLPID CID}.Group Indication bitmap; Traffic Indication bitmap} else FMT=1 {Num-pos; Short Basic

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

[See comment 5176.](#)

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5185**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ54(subclause=6.3.2.3.46,page=97,line=16): Should use math symbol.

Starting Page # **97**

Starting Line # **16**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.46**

**Suggested Remedy**

'\*' ==> 'x', using math symbol.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

'\*' ==> 'x', using math symbol.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5186**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	98	Starting Line #	47	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.47
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

I object to the resolution of comment 4094, and its predecessor 2095.

Resolution of comment 2095 removed reference and mechanics of the 'Neighbor Preference' from the Neighbor Advertisement (NBR-ADV) message. This feature had previously been added after substantial harmonization activity on NBR-ADV and reflected a perceived need by the group for BS broadcasting the NBR-ADV message to give a subjective/bias indication to MS receiving the message as to which Neighbor BS the Serving BS would prefer MS target for initial network entry as well as handover.

The reason that this mechanic was removed through the resolution of 2095 was because of a perceived lack of defined/structured mechanics for objective differentiation of the various selection responses. Specifically, how does a given BS know whether to declare one neighbor BS a 'Preferred BS' and another neighbor BS a 'Normal BS'. While I agree that no objective mechanics were defined, that rationale for removal is flawed. It was always intended that selection of 'type' of Neighbor Preference would be entirely subjective; that this was a hook for different vendors to apply differing criteria in determining individual Neighbor Preference. For some networks, it might be based on some CINR threshold; on others it might be based on sector granularity for differently configured cells; for others it might be differentiating between pico, micro, and macro cells. The point is that it was entirely subjective, and there was nothing wrong with that. It would not interfere with interoperable performance to have this feature subjectively assigned, and inclusion provides a simple mechanism for networks to direct entering or re-entering MS toward neighbor BS that would in some way benefit the network; though the activity is not enforced through this mechanism.

Finally, through use of the new 'Skip-Optional-Fields bitmap' implementors of the standard need not use this feature, nor suffer the 1 byte transmission penalty, should they elect not to use this optional feature.

Comment 4094 asked that the feature be reinstated in the modified remedy to alleviate the previous concerns. The Groups reason for rejection was flawed. The Group rejected for:

'Vote: 8-4

For handoff, this capability already exists since target BS list is sorted by preference. This capability provides no real benefit for initial entry as the MS would not yet have a serving BS.'

MS lack of having a Serving BS is irrelevant. MS entering the network can, and certainly should synchronize to the first channel and BS that it detects, then listen for the NBR-ADV message in order to obtain information about the network and other channels & Neighbor BS available while avoiding lengthy scanning of all available channels, and, even worse, unnecessary air interface overhead as the MS performs network entry into a less desirable BS. This would all be done before the MS enters the network; before the MS has a Serving BS.

The most valuable use for the excised feature, and the rationale for its reinstatement, is that:

1) it permits the BS, and thereby the network to subjectively direct or prioritize Neighbor BS for MS that have received a NBR-ADV broadcast message but have yet to join the network. This is extremely useful in that an MS need not actually enter the network, with appropriate delay and unnecessary non-productive air interface overhead, in order to get a list of prioritized Neighbor BS for the network. The MS need only decode a NBR-ADV broadcast message on the first channel and BS it detects, thereby acquiring the channels, operating characteristics, and network prioritization for all Neighbor BS to the sampled BS. Note that this would allow the MS to then conduct a much more efficiently focused and less protracted scanning and ranging of Neighbor BS to perform network entry, tailoring the choices to the network preferences.

2) can be of similar benefit as in 1), but for MS that have actually entered the network, but have yet to scan Neighbor BS to create data to prioritize targets for an immediate HO. In a high mobility environment this can be immensely helpful. Note that this also allows the MS to rely, to a degree, on the regularly scheduled NBR-ADV broadcast message instead of creating specific unicast HO messaging, which may be unnecessary air interface

the regularly scheduled NBR-ADV broadcast message instead of creating specific unicast HO messaging, which may be unnecessary air interface overhead to the MS current needs.

Essentially, the feature is very useful in focusing both MS conducting initial entry and HO, in instances when they have yet to conduct scanning and ranging to Neighbor BS, to focus their activity on BS subjectively preferred by the sampled BS. It can eliminate unproductive scanning, ranging, and HO messaging overhead at times when inadequate information is available.

Again, reinstatement of this excised feature, do the mechanics involved, would not increase overhead for anyone not using this optional feature while providing those who choose to use it an opportunity to reduce air interface overhead and network entry latency.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[In 6.3.2.3.47 Neighbor Advertisement (MOB\_NBR-ADV) message, Table 108f, page 101, line 16, modify table by insert before '}':]*

'reserved | 6 bits | Shall be set to zero  
Neighbor Preference | 2 bits | 00 Normal  
01 Preferred  
10 Non-Preferred  
11 Reserved'

*[In 6.3.2.3.47 Neighbor Advertisement (MOB\_NBR-ADV) message, page 103, line 18, modify by Insert before 'DCD Configuration Change Count:']*

#### ' Neighbor Preference

The Neighbor Preference field is present only if bit #3 of Skip-Optional-Fields bitmap is '0'. It defines an implementation specific, subjective preference for MS network entry and handover to neighbor BS, as determined by the serving BS (see section 6.3.21.1.1.1)'

*[Add new sub-section to 6.3.21.1.1, page 170, line 35; Insert new section 6.3.21.1.1.1:]*

#### **6.3.21.1.1.1 Neighbor preference**

The message element "Neighbor Preference" in MOB\_NBR-ADV MAC Management message defines a subjective assignment of handover priorities or preferences as determined and set by the serving base station. The serving BS may consider factors including, but not limited to, neighbor BS CINR service threshold, configuration including sectorization and service granularity support, coverage footprint, current loading, and QoS support in deciding to report a BS as a handover candidate, according to the rules specified by a handover policy management entity out-of-scope of this standard. Neighbor Preference is a mechanism to permit a serving BS to influence MS decisions for network entry and handover. MS may use information obtained through Neighbor Preference to prejudice a decision on which BS to conduct initial network entry, or to construct and prioritize BS in a MOB\_MSHO-REQ message.'

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Rejected

Recommendation by

#### Reason for Recommendation

Selection of 'type' of Neighbor Preference is entirely subjective and vendor-dependent.

The commenter says: "for some networks, it might be based on some CINR threshold; on others it might be based on sector granularity for differently configured cells etc."

It is not correct:

it will be based on different criteria for BSs from different vendors within sane network . Moreover, criteria applied by each single BS will remain UNKNOWN to other BSs assuming they are from another vendor[s]. This effectively precludes from having any sort of intelligent group behavior in the network.

the network.

If this feature is necessary, serving BS may include the BS (preferred BS in this comment) in MOB\_BSHO-RSP as recommended target BS.

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Rejected**

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

Selection of 'type' of Neighbor Preference is entirely subjective and vendor-dependent.

The commenter says: "for some networks, it might be based on some CINR threshold; on others it might be based on sector granularity for differently configured cells etc."

If this feature is necessary, serving BS may include the BS (preferred BS in this comment) in MOB\_BSHO-RSP as recommended target BS.

The criteria for the list is subjective, and the decision of the mobile is also subjective, and there is no clear definition of what the mobile is supposed to do with it and no clear benefit for this capability.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5187**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **098** Starting Line # **54**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.2.3.47**

It is not clear whether the sentence is optional or mandatory.

Suggested Remedy

**Modify**

BSs ~~have to~~ may keep mapping-tables of neighbor BS MAC addresses...

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

BSs ~~have to~~ shall keep mapping-tables of neighbor BS MAC addresses...

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

BSs ~~have to~~ shall keep mapping-tables of neighbor BS MAC addresses...

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5188**

Comment submitted by: **Victor**

**Stolpman**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **103**

Starting Line # **57**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.3.47**

The description is about UCD not DCD

Suggested Remedy

Change DCD to UCD.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 5177.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **) none needed**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5189**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **104** Starting Line # **51** Fig/Table# Section  
 Sense of "Scan type" parameter was changed: now it actually just defines the structure of the message, not action to be performed

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

An MS may request the scanning allocation to perform scanning with ~~Scan type = 0~~, or non-contention Association ranging with ~~Scan type = 1~~.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change

An MS may request the scanning allocation to perform scanning with ~~Scan type = 0~~, or non-contention Association ranging with ~~Scan type = 1~~.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change

An MS may request the scanning allocation to perform scanning with ~~Scan type = 0~~, or non-contention Association ranging with ~~Scan type = 1~~.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5190**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **104** Starting Line # **57** Fig/Table# **108h** Section **6.3.2.3.48**

The comment #4098 was accepted during the last meeting. But the resolution was not reflected on IEEE802.16e/D8.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add Scan duration field in MOB\_SCN-REQ message as follows:

Table 108h-MOB\_SCN-REQ message format

Syntax	Size(bits)	Notes
MOB_SCN-REQ_Message_Format(){	-	-
Management Message Type = 54	8	-
<u>Scan duration</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>Units are frames</u>

.....

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Add Scan duration field in MOB\_SCN-REQ message as follows:

Table 108h-MOB\_SCN-REQ message format

Syntax	Size(bits)	Notes
MOB_SCN-REQ_Message_Format(){	-	-
Management Message Type = 54	8	-
<u>Scan duration</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>Units are frames</u>

.....

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Add Scan duration field in MOB\_SCN-REQ message as follows:

Table 108h-MOB\_SCN-REQ message format

Syntax	Size(bits)	Notes
MOB_SCN-REQ_Message_Format(){	-	-
Management Message Type = 54	8	-
<u>Scan duration</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>Units are frames</u>

.....

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5191**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **105** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.48**

There is no field which indicates scanning without association.  
And description of some parameters in SCN-REQ is ambiguous.

**Suggested Remedy**

1. Modify "association type" field in Table 180h and 108i as follow.

Association type	Scan type	3
	0b000:	Scanning without association
	0b001:	Scanning with association level 0: association without coordination
	0b010:	Scanning with association level 1: association with coordination
	0b011:	Scanning with association level 2: NW assisted association reporting
	0b100 - 0b111:	Reserved

2. Modify the description of some paramters on page 105 and 106 as follow

**Scan duration**

Duration (in units of frames) of the requested scanning period

**Scan Association type**

Type of **scanning or** association to be used by the MS and coordinated by the Serving BS (if Association type >=0b010).

**Comp\_NBR\_BS\_ID\_IND**

Indicates whether to use BS index (8 bits) or BS\_ID (48 bits) or.

**BS\_index**

BS\_index is a compressed identifier of a neighbor BS, whith the index assigned in the order of appearance of the BS in the MOB\_NBR\_ADV message.

**Scan type**

~~Signals presence of information on BSs with which MS intends to perform Association.~~

**Interleaving Interval**

The period of MS's Normal Operation which is interleaved between Scanning Durations.

**Scan Iteration**

The requested number of iterating scanning interval by an MS

**N\_Recommended\_BS\_Scanning**

~~Number of BSs which the MS plans to scan only~~

**Recommended BS ID Scanning**

~~BS IDs of those BSs the MS plans to scan~~

**N\_Recommended\_BS\_Association**

Number of BSs which the MS plans to scan **with or without** ~~and try~~ association

**Recommended BS ID Association**

BS IDs of those BSs the MS plans to scan **with or without** ~~and try~~ association. ~~The "Recommended BS ID Association" field may be included only if an MS has a candidate available BS. It means that MS calls Serving BS for assistance to make appointment with the Recommended BS for non-contention based ranging opportunity to perform association.~~

1. Modify "association type" field in Table 180h and 108i as follow.

Association type   3	0b000: Scanning without association
	0b001: Scanning with association level 0: association without coordination
	0b010: Scanning with association level 1: association with coordination
	0b011: Scanning with association level 2: NW assisted association reporting
	0b100 - 0b111: Reserved

2. Modify the description of some paramters on page 105 and 106 as follow

Scan duration

Duration (in units of frames) of the requested scanning period

Scan Association type

Type of scanning or association to be used by the MS and coordinated by the Serving BS (if Association type >=0b010).

Comp\_NBR\_BS\_ID\_IND

Indicates whether to use BS index (8 bits) or BS\_ID (48 bits) or.

BS\_index

BS\_index is a compressed identifier of a neighbor BS, whith the index assigned in the order of appearance of the BS in the MOB\_NBR\_ADV message.

Scan type

~~Signals presence of information on BSs with which MS intends to perform Association.~~

Interleaving Interval

The period of MS's Normal Operation which is interleaved between Scanning Durations.

Scan Iteration

The requested number of iterating scanning interval by an MS

N\_Recommended\_BS\_Scanning

~~Number of BSs which the MS plans to scan only~~

Recommended BS ID Scanning

~~BS IDs of those BSs the MS plans to scan~~

N\_Recommended\_BS\_Association

Number of BSs which the MS plans to scan with or without and try association

Recommended BS ID Association

BS IDs of those BSs the MS plans to scan with or without and try association. ~~The "Recommended BS ID Association" field may be included only if an MS has a candidate available BS. It means that MS calls Serving BS for assistance to make appointment with the Recommended BS for non-contention based ranging opportunity to perform association.~~

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

1. Modify "association type" field in Table 180h and 108i as follow.

Association type   3	0b000: Association level 0 with scanning: association without coordination
	0b001: Association level 1 with scanning: association with coordination
	0b010: Association level 2 with scanning: NW assisted association reporting
	0b011: No association with scanning

| | 0b011100 - 0b111: Reserved

2. Modify the description of some paramters on page 105 and 106 as follow

Scan duration

Duration (in units of frames) of the requested scanning period

**Association type**

Type of **scanning or** association to be used by the MS and coordinated by the Serving BS (if Association type  $\geq$  0b010).

Comp\_NBR\_BS\_ID\_IND

Indicates whether to use BS index (8 bits) or BS\_ID (48 bits) or.

BS\_index

BS\_index is a compressed identifier of a neighbor BS, whith the index assigned in the order of appearance of the BS in the MOB\_NBR\_ADV message.

~~Scan type~~

~~Signals presence of information on BSs with which MS intends to perform Association.~~

Interleaving Interval

The period of MS's Normal Operation which is interleaved between Scanning Durations.

Scan Iteration

The requested number of iterating scanning interval by an MS

~~N\_Recommended\_BS\_Scanning~~

~~Number of BSs which the MS plans to scan only~~

~~Recommended BS ID Scanning~~

~~BS IDs of those BSs the MS plans to scan~~

~~N\_Recommended\_BS\_Association~~

Number of BSs which the MS plans to scan **with or without** ~~and try~~ association

~~Recommended BS ID Association~~

BS IDs of those BSs the MS plans to scan **with or without** ~~and try~~ association. ~~The "Recommended BS ID Association" field may be included only if an MS has a candidate available BS. It means that MS calls Serving BS for assistance to make appointment with the Recommended BS for non-contention based ranging opportunity to perform association.~~

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5192**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **105** Starting Line # **17**

Fig/Table# **108h** Section **6.3.2.3.48**

The MOB\_SCN-REQ message format contains an invalid for-loop field.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"~~For~~if (Comp\_NBR\_BSID\_IND == 1) "

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Change text as follows:

"~~For~~if (Comp\_NBR\_BSID\_IND == 1) "

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"~~For~~if (Comp\_NBR\_BSID\_IND == 1) "

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5193**Comment submitted by: **Rajesh****Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **106** Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.49**

Comment #4102 was approved in session #37. MOB-SCAN\_RSP message was changed according to contribution C802.16e-05/221r1. But the change is not reflected in D8.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change MOB\_SCAN-RSP message according to contribution C802.16e-05/221r

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superceded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment 5611.](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5194**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Language clarification	Technical, Non-binding	106	14		

Suggested Remedy  
Change

Recommended BS ID Association  
BS IDs of those BSs the MS plans to scan and try association. The 'Recommended BS ID Association' field ~~may be~~ **are** included only if an the MS has a candidate available BSs **for association. Information on such BSs may be obtained with assistance of** ~~It means that MS calls~~ Serving BS **that may for assistance to make provide the MS with an** appointment with the Recommended BS for non-contention based ranging opportunity to perform association.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Withdrawn** Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Withdrawn**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions  none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5195**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **107** Starting Line # **47** Fig/Table# **108i** Section **6.3.2.3.49**

If the recommended neighbour is not advertised in the MOB\_NBR-ADV, the MS needs PHY profile information for the neighbour to know where to scan.

**Suggested Remedy**

If (Comp-NBR\_BSID\_IND == 0), insert a "PHY\_Profile\_ID" attribute. Copy text describing this attribute from §6.3.2.3.47, pages 99 and 102.

On page 108, insert the following text - "The following TLV parameters may be included:

DCD settings [text from §6.3.2.3.47, page 103]

UCD settings [text from §6.3.2.3.47, page 103]"

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Recommended BS should always be from in the NBR-ADV list.

An MS lists neighbor BSs to scan based on received MOB\_NBR-ADV message. How can an MS know neighbor BS ID without receiving MOB\_NBR-ADV message?

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Not needed for system operation.

Recommended BS should always be from in the NBR-ADV list.

An MS lists neighbor BSs to scan based on received MOB\_NBR-ADV message. How can an MS know neighbor BS ID without receiving MOB\_NBR-ADV message?

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5196**

Comment submitted by: **Seokheon**

**Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **108** Starting Line # **45** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.49**

The description of "N\_Recommended\_BS" is wrong.

**Suggested Remedy**

Modify the description of "N\_Recommended\_BS" as follows.

N\_Recommended\_BS

Number of BSs which the BS recommends to scan with or without scanning **association**

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Modify the description of "N\_Recommended\_BS" as follows.

N\_Recommended\_BS

Number of BSs which the BS recommends to scan with or without scanning **association**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Modify the description of "N\_Recommended\_BS" as follows.

N\_Recommended\_BS

Number of BSs which the BS recommends to scan with or without scanning **association**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5197**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **109** Starting Line # **48** Fig/Table# **108j** Section **6.3.2.3.50**

The description of N\_current\_BS in MOB\_SCN-REPORT is wrong.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the following change to the 'Notes' field of 'N\_current\_BSs'

"When FBSS/SHO is ~~not~~ supported, N\_current\_BSs is the number of BSs currently in the active set; When FBSS/SHO is not supported or the MS has an empty active set, N\_current\_BSs is set to 1."

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Make the following change to the 'Notes' field of 'N\_current\_BSs'

"When FBSS/SHO is ~~not~~ supported, N\_current\_BSs is the number of BSs currently in the active set; When FBSS/SHO is not supported, N\_current\_BSs is set to 1."

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Make the following change to the 'Notes' field of 'N\_current\_BSs'

"When FBSS/SHO is ~~not~~ supported, N\_current\_BSs is the number of BSs currently in the active set; When FBSS/SHO is not supported, N\_current\_BSs is set to 1."

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5198**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	111	Starting Line #	8	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.3.50
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	------------

The text describing the RSSI mean parameter is incorrect. The text suggests 0.5 dB steps, but the example range is consistent with 0.25 dB steps. In addition, the example is off by 0.25 dB.

**Suggested Remedy**

[Replace the following text]

## BS RSSI mean

The BS RSSI mean parameter indicates the Received Signal Strength measured by the MS from the particular BS. The value shall be interpreted as an unsigned byte with units of 0.5 dB, and have 40 dBm subtracted from it (such that 0xff is interpreted as -104dBm), an MS shall be able to report values in the range -100 dBm to -40 dBm. The measurement shall be performed on the frame preamble and averaged over the measurement period.

[Suggested change for correction]

## BS RSSI mean

The BS RSSI mean parameter indicates the Received Signal Strength measured by the MS from the particular BS. The value shall be interpreted as an unsigned byte with units of -0.25 dB, and have 40 dBm subtracted from it (such that 0xff is interpreted as -103.75 dBm), an MS shall be able to report values in the range -103.75 dBm to -40 dBm. The measurement shall be performed on the frame preamble and averaged over the

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

[Replace the following text]

## BS RSSI mean

The BS RSSI mean parameter indicates the Received Signal Strength measured by the MS from the particular BS. The value shall be interpreted as an unsigned byte with units of 0.5 dB, and have 40 dBm subtracted from it (such that 0xff is interpreted as -104dBm), an MS shall be able to report values in the range -100 dBm to -40 dBm. The measurement shall be performed on the frame preamble and averaged over the measurement period.

[Suggested change for correction]

## BS RSSI mean

The BS RSSI mean parameter indicates the Received Signal Strength measured by the MS from the particular BS. The value shall be interpreted as an unsigned byte with units of -0.25 dB, and have 40 dBm subtracted from it (such that 0xff is interpreted as -103.75 dBm), an MS shall be able to report values in the range -103.75 dBm to -40 dBm. The measurement shall be performed on the frame preamble and averaged over the **measurement period**.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted modified

[Replace the following text]

BS RSSI mean

The BS RSSI mean parameter indicates the Received Signal Strength measured by the MS from the particular BS. The value shall be interpreted as an unsigned byte with units of 0.5 dB, and have 40 dBm subtracted from it (such that 0xff is interpreted as -104dBm), an MS shall be able to report values in the range -100 dBm to -40 dBm. The measurement shall be performed on the frame preamble and averaged over the measurement period.

[Suggested change for correction]

BS RSSI mean

The BS RSSI mean parameter indicates the Received Signal Strength measured by the MS from the particular BS. The value shall be interpreted as an unsigned byte with units of -0.25 dB, and have 40 dBm subtracted from it (such that 0xff is interpreted as -103.75 dBm), an MS shall be able to report values in the range -103.75 dBm to -40 dBm. The measurement shall be performed on the frame preamble and averaged over the **measurement period**.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5199**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Non-binding	111	23		6.3.2.3.50

All other mobility management messages include an HMAC Tuple TLV to authenticate the source of the message. Since the MOB\_SCAN-REPORT can trigger allocation of radio and network resources for handover or active set update, this message should also be authenticated.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following text - "[The MOB\\_SCAN-REPORT message shall include the following parameters encoded as TLV tuples: HMAC Tuple \(See 11.1.2.\)](#)"

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Add the following text - "[The MOB\\_SCAN-REPORT message shall include the following parameters encoded as TLV tuples: HMAC Tuple \(See 11.1.2.\)](#)"

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Add the following text - "[The MOB\\_SCAN-REPORT message shall include the following parameters encoded as TLV tuples: HMAC Tuple \(See 11.1.2.\)](#)"

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5200**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ55(subclause=6.3.2.3.51,page=112,line=36): Blank cells.**

Starting Page # **112** Starting Line # **36**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.51**

Suggested Remedy  
Fillin spaces with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fillin spaces with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5201**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **112** Starting Line # **59** Fig/Table# **108k** Section **6.3.2.3.51**

The description of Report Mode below the table is wrong. The note in the table is correct.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove the note below the table:

~~"Report mode—The offset of the OFDMA symbol in which the burst starts, the offset value is defined in units of OFDMA symbols and is relevant to the Allocation Start Time field given in the UL-MAP message."~~

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

1. Remove the note below the table:

~~"Report mode—The offset of the OFDMA symbol in which the burst starts, the offset value is defined in units of OFDMA symbols and is relevant to the Allocation Start Time field given in the UL-MAP message."~~

2. Remove "Report mode" in Table 108k.MOB\_ASC-REPORT message format, page 112, line 14 :

Table 108k.MOB\_ASC-REPORT message format

Syntax	Type	Size	Notes
...			
<del>Report mode</del>		<del>1</del>	<del>0: Event triggered</del>
...			

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

1. Remove the note below the table:

~~"Report mode—The offset of the OFDMA symbol in which the burst starts, the offset value is defined in units of OFDMA symbols and is relevant to the Allocation Start Time field given in the UL-MAP message."~~

2. Remove "Report mode" in Table 108k.MOB\_ASC-REPORT message format, page 112, line 14 :

Table 108k.MOB\_ASC-REPORT message format

Syntax	Type	Size	Notes
...			

~~Report mode 1 0: Event triggered~~



...

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5202**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **113** Starting Line # **40** Fig/Table# **108I** Section **6.3.2.3.52**

There are 2 SDU messages defined for BS HO: MOB-BSHO-REQ and MOB-BSHO-RSP. These 2 SDUs are extremely long and complicated, including dozens of fields and possible TLVs. However, they are very similar in terms of format and in terms of usage. Suggested remedy: unite the 2 SDUs into a single message (MOB-BSHO-RSP) in order to reduce standard complexity and inconsistency, not to mention reduction of implementation costs. Change all references to MOB-BSHO-REQ in the standard to MOB-BSHO-RSP.

**Suggested Remedy**

Specific changes in the standard:

**[Change in Table 14, p.42]**~~[Delete type 56, MOB\_BSHO-REQ]~~**[Completely delete section 6.3.2.3.52]**~~Delete section 6.3.2.3.52 (MOB-BSHO-REQ)~~~~Delete table 108I (MOB-BSHO-REQ)~~**[Change in section 6.3.2.3.54]**

The BS may transmit a MOB-BSHO-RSP when it wants to initiate an HO (unsolicited) or upon reception of MOB-MSHO-REQ. The message shall be transmitted on the Basic CID. An MS receiving this message may scan recommended neighbor BSs in this message.

**[Change in table 108n (MOB-BSHO-RSP)]****[Add immediately after "Management Message Type"]**

Network supported HO (1 bit)

Mode (3 bits)

Unsolicited (1 bit) Indicates if the HO is unsolicited.

Reserved ~~5-bits~~ --> 3 bits**[Change in section 6.3.21]****[merge all occurrences of MOB\_BSHO-REQ with MOB\_BSHO-RSP]**~~MOB\_BSHO-REQ~~ MOB\_BSHO-RSP

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

For a clear operation of handover handshake between MS and serving BS, two messages (BSHO-REQ and BSHO-RSP) should be separated as they are in D8. Because these two messages have each own function; one is for handover initiation request and the other is for response to MS. When these two messages are merged into one, the description of handover procedure becomes unclear because MS and BS exchange a message of the same name but with two meanings.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Rejected

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

For a clear operation of handover handshake between MS and serving BS, two messages (BSHO-REQ and BSHO-RSP) should be separated as they are in D8. Because these two messages have each own function; one is for handover initiation request and the other is for response to MS. When these two messages are merged into one, the description of handover procedure becomes unclear because MS and BS exchange a message of the same name but with two meanings.

MOB-BSHO-REQ and MOB-BSHO-RSP is for different purpose and show different procedure. The merging to one message get no gain rather impose confusion on the procedure of handover

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    1) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5203**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **113** Starting Line # **57** Fig/Table# **108l** Section **6.3.2.3.52**

The "Network Assisted HO supported" field is only appropriate for a Handover (HO) Request and this field already exists inside the case statement for "Mode = 0b000".

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the (first) "Network Assisted HO supported" field.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change as indicated:

Network Assisted HO supported | 1 | Indicates that the servicing BS supports Network Assisted HO

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change as indicated:

Network Assisted HO supported | 1 | Indicates that the servicing BS supports Network Assisted HO

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5204**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	114	Starting Line #	43	Fig/Table#	108l	Section	6.3.2.3.52
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	------	---------	------------

To enable fast HO, include a list of new CID and SAID values for each candidate BS in Mode 0b000 rather than forcing CID and SAID updates to be communicated through an unsolicited REG-RSP message during network re-entry. This is similar to the capability already provided for other (FBSS) modes.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following to the definition for "Mode 0b000":

N\_CIDs; // number of CIDs that need to be reassigned

for (j=0; j< N\_CIDs; j++) {

  New\_CID;

}

N\_SAIDs; // number of SAIDs that need to be reassigned

for (j=0; j< N\_SAIDs; j++) {

  New\_SAID;

}

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation**

This would require ALL POTENTIAL target BS in the list to provision CIDs from their limited pool in anticipation of a HO that may never occur.

Normal HO is different from FBSS mode. In normal HO (even the fast normal HO), ranging will be performed when the MS performs network entry at the target BS. The CID allocations are already included in RNG-RSP message. It is better to include CID allocation in RNG-RSP message at target BS since it is assumed that the MS and the target BS should have a better RF condition which is more reliable and probably transmitting at a higher rate. When the MS is performing normal HO (HHO), it is not desirable to make HO messages at the source BS too long.

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This would require ALL POTENTIAL target BS in the list to provision CIDs from their limited pool in anticipation of a HO that may never occur.

Normal HO is different from FBSS mode. In normal HO (even the fast normal HO), ranging will be performed when the MS performs network entry at the target BS. The CID allocations are already included in RNG-RSP message. It is better to include CID allocation in RNG-RSP message at target BS since it is assumed that the MS and the target BS should have a better RF condition which is more reliable and probably transmitting at a higher rate. When the MS is performing normal HO (HHO), it is not desirable to make HO messages at the source BS too long.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5205**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment            Type **Technical, Non-binding**            Starting Page # **119**    Starting Line # **16**            Fig/Table# **108l**            Section **6.3.2.3.52**

The "Resource Retain Type" field is only appropriate for Handover (HO) and this field already exists inside the case statement for "Mode = 0b000".

Suggested Remedy

Delete the (second) "Resource Retain Type" field.

Proposed Resolution            Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Delete the (second) "Resource Retain Type" field.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Delete the (second) "Resource Retain Type" field.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5206**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **119** Starting Line # **20** Fig/Table# **108l** Section **6.3.2.3.52**

MOB\_BSHO-REQ message contains TLV information 'Resource retain time'. Therefore TLV field is inserted MOB\_BSHO-REQ message format.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following after 'padding' in line 18:

-----  
TLV encoded information | variable | TLV specific  
-----

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Add the following after 'padding' in line 18:

-----  
TLV encoded information | variable | TLV specific  
-----

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Add the following after 'padding' in line 18:

-----  
TLV encoded information | variable | TLV specific  
-----

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5207**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **125** Starting Line # **13** Fig/Table# **108n** Section **6.3.2.3.54**

The MOB\_BSHO-REQ message includes a "Network Assisted Handover" field for Mode 0b000 but this flag is missing from the MOB\_BSHO-RSP message.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add a "Network Assisted Handover" field for Mode 0b000 with text copied from §6.3.2.3.52

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

In the table (page 125 line 13), insert after "HO process optimization" row:

"Network Assisted HO supported | 1 | Indicates that the BS supports Network Assisted HO"

On line 31, change the number of reserved bits from 6 to 5.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

In the table (page 125 line 13), insert after "HO process optimization" row:

"Network Assisted HO supported | 1 | Indicates that the BS supports Network Assisted HO"

On line 31, change the number of reserved bits from 6 to 5.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5208**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **125** Starting Line # **13** Fig/Table# **108n** Section **6.3.2.3.54**

The MOB\_BSHO-REQ message includes a "Resource Retain Type" field for Mode 0b000 but this flag is missing from the MOB\_BSHO-RSP message.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add a "Resource Retain Type" field for Mode 0b000 with text copied from §6.3.2.3.52

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

In the table (page 125 line 13), insert after "HO process optimization" row:

```

"Resource Retain Type" | 1 | 0: Release connection information
                        1: Retain connection information"

```

On line 31, change the number of reserved bits as appropriate.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

In the table (page 125 line 13), insert after "HO process optimization" row:

```

"Resource Retain Type" | 1 | 0: Release connection information
                        1: Retain connection information"

```

On line 31, change the number of reserved bits as appropriate.

On page 129, line 59 remove the row containing "Resource Retain Type"

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5209**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **125** Starting Line # **15** Fig/Table# **108n** Section **6.3.2.3.54**

To enable fast HO, include a list of new CID and SAID values for each candidate BS in Mode 0b000 rather than forcing CID and SAID updates to be communicated through an unsolicited REG-RSP message during network re-entry. This is similar to the capability already provided for other (FBSS) modes.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following to the definition for "Mode 0b000":

```

N_CIDs; // number of CIDs that need to be reassigned
for (j=0; j< N_CIDs; j++) {
  New_CID;
}
N_SAIDs; // number of SAIDs that need to be reassigned
for (j=0; j< N_SAIDs; j++) {
  New_SAID;
}

```

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

This would require ALL POTENTIAL target BS in the list to provision CIDs from their limited pool in anticipation of a HO that may never occur.

Normal HO is different from FBSS mode. In normal HO (even the fast normal HO), ranging will be performed when the MS performs network entry at the target BS. The CID allocations are already included in RNG-RSP message. It is better to include CID allocation in RNG-RSP message at target BS since it is assumed that the MS and the target BS should have a better RF condition which is more reliable and probably transmitting at a higher rate. When the MS is performing normal HO (HHO), it is not desirable to make HO messages at the source BS too long.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5210**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **129** Starting Line # **58** Fig/Table# **108n** Section **6.3.2.3.54**

The "Resource Retain Type" field is only appropriate for Handover (HO). Another comment recommends adding this field to the case statement for Mode 0b000.

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the "Resource Retain Type" field.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5208

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5211**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Non-binding	133	27		6.3.2.3.55

The MS cannot choose the handover mode but must, instead, follow the mode dictated by the BS.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following explanatory text:

"Mode must reflect the handover mode signalled by the BS in the previous MOB\_BSHO-REQ or MOB\_BSHO-RSP message".

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Add the following explanatory text:

"The MS shall use the handover mode signalled by the BS in the previous MOB\_BSHO-REQ or MOB\_BSHO-RSP message to perform handover".

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Add the following explanatory text:

"The MS shall use the handover mode signalled by the BS in the previous MOB\_BSHO-REQ or MOB\_BSHO-RSP message to perform handover".

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5212**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ56(subclause=6.3.2.3.55,page=133,line=28): Binary values wrong	Editorial, Satisfied (was	133	28		6.3.2.3.55

**Suggested Remedy**

==> 0b00, etc.  
here and throughout

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

==> 0b00, etc.  
here and throughout

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5213**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **134** Starting Line # **26** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.56**

MS MAC address hash is not defined properly: The note in Table 108p claims the polynomial is 864CFB, the note below the Table claims it to be 1864cfb. Furthermore the generator polynomial g(D) is equal to 1864CF9.

**Suggested Remedy**

Pick one and correct the other two instances.  
For instance, if 1864CFB is the chosen polynomial:  
\* Change the note in the Table: "1864CFB"  
\* Change the polynomial on line 60 as follows: "+D4+D3+D+1"

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

Recommendation by

Pick one and correct the other two instances.  
For instance, if 1864CFB is the chosen polynomial:  
\* Change the note in the Table: "1864CFB"  
\* Change the polynomial on line 60 as follows: "+D4+D3+D+1"

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted**

Pick one and correct the other two instances.  
For instance, if 1864CFB is the chosen polynomial:  
\* Change the note in the Table: "1864CFB"  
\* Change the polynomial on line 60 as follows: "+D4+D3+D+1"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5214**

Comment submitted by: Mo-Han

Fong

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **135** Starting Line # **19** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.56**

I object to the text change corresponding to the resolution of comment #4129, because some proposed text change in contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/143r8 was omitted.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Make the following text change on section 6.3.2.3.56, page 135, lines 19-24]*

CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment (11.18.1)

OFDMA-PHY specific parameter used to indicate CDMA code assignment and transmission opportunity assigned to one or more MSs being paged in this message. One CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment in the TLV corresponds to one MS paged. The order of the assignments is the same as the order of appearance of MS MAC address hash in this message.

*[Make the following text change on section 6.3.2.3.56, page 135, lines 31-32]*

Page-Response window (11.18.2)

OFDMA-PHY specific parameter used to indicate the time window (in unit of frames) during which the MS shall transmit the CDMA code at the transmission opportunity assigned in the CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment TLV. The start of the window is the next frame after receiving the MOB\_PAG-ADV.

*[Make the following text change on section 6.3.22.8.1, page 196, lines 52-64]*

— After receiving the MOB\_PAG-ADV and within the Page-Response window, the MS shall transmit the assigned ranging code at the transmission opportunity in the at the assigned ranging region frames where dedicated ranging regions are assigned in the UL-MAP IE (UIUC = 12 and dedicated ranging indicator bit set to 1). ~~in consecutive frames during the Page-Response window.~~ The consecutive assigned ranging code transmission can be terminated early if the MS receives a RNG-RSP message with 'success' status before the end of the Page-Response window.

— In the case where RNG-RSP message with 'continue' status is received and within the Page-Response window, then the BS may allocate in the UL-MAP dedicated ranging region, in this case, the MS shall use transmit the assigned ranging code at the transmission opportunity in the next frame where the dedicated ranging region is assigned. ~~provided in the MOB\_PAG-ADV message.~~

— In the case where RNG-RSP message with 'success' status is not received within the Page-Response window, the MS shall continue with the normal initial ranging procedure for Network Re-entry from Idle (6.3.22.10) or Idle Mode Location Update (6.3.22.9.2).

— In the case where no RNG-RSP message is received or no dedicated ranging region is assigned within the Page-Response window to the MS, the MS shall continue with the normal initial ranging procedure for in the normal Network Re-entry from Idle (6.3.22.10) or Idle Mode Location Update (6.3.22.9.2). ~~procedure, as described in 6.3.21.9.2~~

*[Make the following text change on section 11.18.1, page 565, lines 26-44]*

11.18.1 CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment

The 'CDMA code assignment' field indicates the assigned code and the transmission opportunity for a MS who is paged to use over dedicated CDMA ranging channel region.



Type	Length (bits)	Value	Scope
150	variable; ( $8N_{\text{assign}} + N_{\text{assign}} \times 816$ )	Bit #0 - #7: $N_{\text{assign}}$ Subsequent ( $N_{\text{assign}} \times 816$ ) bits: for ( $i = 0, i < N_{\text{assign}}, i++$ ) { 8-bits code index assigned to a MS who is paged <u>8 bits transmission opportunity offset assigned to a MS who is paged</u> }	OFDMA

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

*[Make the following text change on section 6.3.2.3.56, page 135, lines 19-24]*

CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment (11.18.1)

OFDMA-PHY specific parameter used to indicate CDMA code assignment and transmission opportunity assigned to one or more MSs being paged in this message. One CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment in the TLV corresponds to one MS paged. The order of the assignments is the same as the order of appearance of MS MAC address hash in this message.

*[Make the following text change on section 6.3.2.3.56, page 135, lines 31-32]*

Page-Response window (11.18.2)

OFDMA-PHY specific parameter used to indicate the time window (in unit of frames) during which the MS shall transmit the CDMA code at the transmission opportunity assigned in the CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment TLV. The start of the window is the next frame after receiving the MOB\_PAG-ADV.

*[Make the following text change on section 6.3.22.8.1, page 196, lines 52-64]*

— After receiving the MOB\_PAG-ADV and within the Page-Response window, the MS shall transmit the assigned ranging code at the transmission opportunity in the at the assigned ranging region frames where dedicated ranging regions are assigned in the UL-MAP IE (UIUC = 12 and dedicated ranging indicator bit set to 1). ~~in consecutive frames during the Page-Response window.~~ The consecutive assigned ranging code transmission can be terminated early if the MS receives a RNG-RSP message with 'success' status before the end of the Page-Response window.

— In the case where RNG-RSP message with 'continue' status is received and within the Page-Response window, ~~then the BS may allocate in the UL-MAP dedicated ranging region, in this case, the MS shall use~~ transmit the assigned ranging code at the transmission opportunity in the next frame where the dedicated ranging region is assigned. ~~provided in the MOB\_PAG-ADV message.~~

— In the case where RNG-RSP message with 'success' status is not received within the Page-Response window, the MS shall continue with the normal initial ranging procedure for Network Re-entry from Idle (6.3.22.10) or Idle Mode Location Update (6.3.22.9.2).

— In the case where no RNG-RSP message is received or no dedicated ranging region is assigned within the Page-Response window to the MS, the MS shall continue with the normal initial ranging procedure for in the normal Network Re-entry from Idle (6.3.22.10) or Idle Mode Location Update (6.3.22.9.2). ~~procedure, as described in 6.3.21.9.2~~

*[Make the following text change on section 11.18.1, page 565, lines 26-44]*

11.18.1 CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment

The 'CDMA code assignment' field indicates the assigned code and the transmission opportunity for a MS who is paged to use over dedicated CDMA ranging channelregion.

Type	Length (bits)	Value	Scope
150	variable; ( $8N_{\text{assign}} + N_{\text{assign}} \times 8$ )	Bit #0 - #7: $N_{\text{assign}}$ Subsequent ( $N_{\text{assign}} \times 8$ ) bits: for ( $i = 0, i < N_{\text{assign}}, i++$ ) { 8-bits code index assigned to a MS who is paged <u>8 bits transmission opportunity offset assigned to a MS who is paged</u> }	OFDMA

## Reason for Recommendation

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

[Make the following text change on section 6.3.2.3.56, page 135, lines 19-24]

CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment (11.18.1)

OFDMA-PHY specific parameter used to indicate CDMA code assignment~~and transmission opportunity assigned~~ to one or more MSs being paged in this message. One CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment in the TLV corresponds to one MS paged. The order of the assignments is the same as the order of appearance of MS MAC address hash in this message.

[Make the following text change on section 6.3.2.3.56, page 135, lines 31-32]

## Page-Response window (11.18.2)

OFDMA-PHY specific parameter used to indicate the time window (in unit of frames) during which the MS shall transmit the CDMA code at the transmission opportunity assigned in the CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment TLV. The start of the window is the next frame after receiving the MOB\_PAG-ADV.

[Make the following text change on section 6.3.22.8.1, page 196, lines 52-64]

— After receiving the MOB\_PAG-ADV and within the Page-Response window, the MS shall transmit the assigned ranging code at the transmission opportunity in the at the assigned ranging region frames where dedicated ranging regions are assigned in the UL-MAP\_IE (UIUC = 12 and dedicated ranging indicator bit set to 1). ~~in consecutive frames during the Page-Response window. The consecutive assigned ranging code~~ transmission can be terminated early if the MS receives a RNG-RSP message with 'success' status before the end of the Page-Response window.

— In the case where RNG-RSP message with 'continue' status is received and within the Page-Response window, then the BS may allocate in the UL-MAP ~~dedicated ranging region, in this case, the MS shall use~~ transmit the assigned ranging code at the transmission opportunity in the next frame where the dedicated ranging region is assigned. ~~provided in the MOB\_PAG-ADV message.~~

— In the case where RNG-RSP message with 'success' status is not received within the Page-Response window, the MS shall continue with the normal initial ranging procedure for Network Re-entry from Idle (6.3.22.10) or Idle Mode Location Update (6.3.22.9.2).

~~normal initial ranging procedure for Network Re-entry from Idle (6.3.22.10) or Idle Mode Location Update (6.3.22.9.2).~~

— In the case where no RNG-RSP message is received or no dedicated ranging region is assigned within the Page-Response window to the MS, the MS shall continue with the normal initial ranging procedure for in the normal Network Re-entry from Idle (6.3.22.10) or Idle Mode Location Update (6.3.22.9.2). procedure, as described in 6.3.21.9.2

[Make the following text change on section 11.18.1, page 565, lines 26-44]

11.18.1 CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment

The 'CDMA code assignment' field indicates the assigned code and the transmission opportunity for a MS who is paged to use over dedicated CDMA ranging channel region.

Type	Length (bits)	Value	Scope
150	variable; (8N <sub>assign</sub> +	Bit #0 - #7: N <sub>assign</sub> Subsequent (N <sub>assign</sub> x 8) bits:	OFDMA

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5215**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ57(subclause=6.3.2.3.57,page=139,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	139	8		6.3.2.3.57

**Suggested Remedy**Center the column under header: Size  
(bits)**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**Center the column under header: Size  
(bits)**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5216**

Comment submitted by: **Jaehee**

**Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **144**

Starting Line # **12**

Fig/Table# **Tabl**

Section **6.3.2.3.59**

I object to the implementation 4121 because the PMC\_RSP message still contains error. Its type is not 65, instead 64.

**Suggested Remedy**

6.3.2.3.59 Power control mode change response (PMC\_RSP) message  
[Modify the table 108w as follows]

Syntax	Size	Notes
Management Message Type = <b>654</b>	8	Type = 64

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation:** Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted**

6.3.2.3.59 Power control mode change response (PMC\_RSP) message  
[Modify the table 108w as follows]

Syntax	Size	Notes
Management Message Type = <b>654</b>	8	Type = 64

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5217**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ58(subclause=6.3.2.3.60,page=146,line=19): Text font wrong.

Starting Page # 146 Starting Line # 19

Fig/Table# Section 6.3.2.3.60

**Suggested Remedy**

==> 8-point Arial within figure.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

==> 8-point Arial within figure.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5218**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **150** Starting Line # **11** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.4.3.4**  
HARQ is not used on all connections with ARQ.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"On connections that use both HARQ and ARQ. The ARQ\_RETRY\_TIMEOUT value shall be set accordingly to allow HARQ retransmission operation of the ARQ block to be completed before ARQ retransmission occurs."

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change text as follows:

"On connections that use both HARQ and ARQ. The ARQ\_RETRY\_TIMEOUT value shall be set accordingly to allow HARQ retransmission operation of the ARQ block to be completed before ARQ retransmission occurs."

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"On connections that use both HARQ and ARQ. The ARQ\_RETRY\_TIMEOUT value shall be set accordingly to allow HARQ retransmission operation of the ARQ block to be completed before ARQ retransmission occurs."

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5219**

Comment submitted by: Lei

Wang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	150	Starting Line #	47	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.5.2.2.1
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------------

The BR (bandwidth request) field appears in multiple MAC signalling headers as defined in table 5a. All those MAC headers with BR field can be used to change the size of the UL allocation for the extended rtPS.

**Suggested Remedy**

make the following change:

The MS may request changing the size of the UL allocation by either using an extended piggyback request field of the Grant Management subheader or using BR field of ~~the MAC signalling headers as described in Table 5a~~ the BR and UL Tx power report header, or sending a codeword (defined in 8.4.5.4.10.13) over CQICH.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

make the following change:

The MS may request changing the size of the UL allocation by either using an extended piggyback request field of the Grant Management subheader or using BR field of ~~the MAC signalling headers as described in Table 5a~~ the BR and UL Tx power report header, or sending a codeword (defined in 8.4.5.4.10.13) over CQICH.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

make the following change:

The MS may request changing the size of the UL allocation by either using an extended piggyback request field of the Grant Management subheader or using BR field of ~~the MAC signalling headers as described in Table 5a~~ the BR and UL Tx power report header, or sending a codeword (defined in 8.4.5.4.10.13) over CQICH.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5220**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	151	Starting Line #	35	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.9.10
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	----------

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: Looks like this instance got changed in the 'global SS-to-MS change' that happened some time ago. Inappropriate SS to MS change breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR.

Simple remedy is to change the MS back to SS where appropriate in the text. Also, since this is replacing an important specification paragraph in 802.16-2004, adjustment must be made to include SS in the revised language.

Changing this back to 'SS' from 'MS' does not hurt us in any way since an MS is always an SS unless otherwise specified.

**Suggested Remedy***[In 6.3.9.10 Establish IP connectivity, page 151, line 43, modify as:]*

'Otherwise, for ~~fixed-MS~~ all SS and for ~~MSs~~ using IPv4 and not using mobile IP, they ~~MS~~ shall invoke DHCP mechanisms [IETF RFC 2131] in order to obtain an IP address and any other parameters needed to establish IP connectivity. If the ~~SS-MS~~ has a configuration file, the DHCP response shall contain the name of a file which contains further configuration parameters. For ~~SS-MS~~ using IPv6, they ~~MS~~ shall either invoke DHCPv6 [IETF RFC 3315] or IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [IETF RFC 2462] based on the value of a TLV tuple in REG\_RSP. Establishment of IP connectivity shall be performed on the ~~SS's-MS's~~ Secondary Management Connection (see Table 110).'

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by***[In 6.3.9.10 Establish IP connectivity, page 151, line 43, modify as:]*

'Otherwise, for ~~fixed-MS~~ all SS and for ~~MSs~~ using IPv4 and not using mobile IP, they ~~MS~~ shall invoke DHCP mechanisms [IETF RFC 2131] in order to obtain an IP address and any other parameters needed to establish IP connectivity. If the ~~SS-MS~~ has a configuration file, the DHCP response shall contain the name of a file which contains further configuration parameters. For ~~SS-MS~~ using IPv6, they ~~MS~~ shall either invoke DHCPv6 [IETF RFC 3315] or IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [IETF RFC 2462] based on the value of a TLV tuple in REG\_RSP. Establishment of IP connectivity shall be performed on the ~~SS's-MS's~~ Secondary Management Connection (see Table 110).'

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

*[In 6.3.9.10 Establish IP connectivity, page 151, line 43, modify as:]*

'Otherwise, for ~~fixed-MS~~ SS and for ~~MSs~~ using IPv4 and not using mobile IP, they ~~MS~~ shall invoke DHCP mechanisms [IETF RFC 2131] in order to obtain an IP address and any other parameters needed to establish IP connectivity. If the SS-MS has a configuration file, the DHCP response shall contain the name of a file which contains further configuration parameters. For SS-MS using IPv6, they ~~MS~~ shall either invoke DHCPv6 [IETF RFC 3315] or IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration [IETF RFC 2462] based on the value of a TLV tuple in REG\_RSP. Establishment of IP connectivity shall be performed on the SS's-MS's Secondary Management Connection (see Table 110).'

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5221**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**Starting Page # **152** Starting Line # **17**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.13**

I object to the resolution of comment 4001.

The Group rejected the comment for:

'Vote: 3-5

Reason: This contribution addresses a larger problem than the original scope.'

This reason for rejection is entirely arbitrary and imprecise and demonstrates a lack of proper review and deliberation. The Group was unable to approve a single one of the 19 individually proposed remedies? All 19 were perceived as exceeding the original mandate for the work? Remember that many of these proposed remedies just said change an instance of 'MS' back to 'SS'; hardly outside the scope of the mandate. Regardless of the reason for the work, each of the 19 remedies were reviewed on their merit? Some of the identified problems were of instances of elements of the 16e DRAFT that are out-of-scope of the 16e PAR and must be remedied to bring the DRAFT back into alignment with its PAR. Regardless of mandate, these issues cannot be just shunted aside without due consideration.

Frankly, the unprofessional disposition of this matter should be a source of embarrassment to the membership.

Problem: Changing out the text here to expand the Multicast feature to include MBS has resulted in a couple of troubling consequences: 1) the language is now MS specific; reference to support SS has been inappropriately removed, breaking backwards compatibility, thus is out-of-scope of the 16e PAR, and 2) it conflicts with changes made to this section in Corrigenda D3. Note that there is a conflict between Table 345 in 16e/D8 and Corrigenda D3.

Remedy is to re-write the subsections to re-instate previous support for Multicast function for legacy SS while preserving the new MBS features and revisions. Also, re-writing allows us to bring the section into alignment with Corrigenda D3.

When reviewing the proposed remedy it is important to remember that an MS is always also an SS unless specifically excepted otherwise.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[In 6.3.13 Multicast and broadcast services (MBS), page 152, lines 37-55, replace as:]*

#### **6.3.13 Multicast and broadcast services (MBS)**

Some globally defined service flows may carry broadcast or multicast information that should be delivered to a plurality of SS or MS. Such service flows have certain QoS parameters and may require encryption performed using a globally defined sequence of TEKs. Since a multicast or broadcast transport connection is associated with a service flow, it is associated with the QoS and traffic parameters for that service flow. Some MS are registered to certain BS while some are in Idle mode and not currently served by any specific BS.

Two types of access to multicast and broadcast services (MBS) may be supported: single-BS access and multi-BS access. Single-BS access is implemented over multicast and broadcast transport connections within one BS, while multi-BS access is implemented by transmitting data from Service Flow(s) over multiple BS. Single-BS access is optional for SS. Multi-BS access is optional for MS. ARQ is not applicable to either single-BS-MBS or multi-BS-MBS. Initiation of MBS with respect to specific SS is always performed in registered state by creation of multicast connection carrying MBS data. During such initiation the SS learns the Service Flow ID that identifies the service. For multi-BS-MBS, each BS capable of providing MBS belongs to a certain MBS Zone, which is a set of BSs where the same CID and same SA is used for transmitting content of certain Service Flow(s). MBS Zone is identified by a unique MBS\_ZONE identifier.'

*[In 6.3.13.1 Single-BS Access, page 152, line 60 through page 153, line 6, replace as:]*

'The BS may provide to SS single-BS access by creating a multicast traffic connection with each SS to be associated with the service, or a broadcast transport connection. Any available traffic CID value may be used for the single-BS-MBS service. The CID used for the service is the same for all SS on the same channel that participate in the connection. The data transmitted on the connection with the given CID shall be received and processed by the MAC of each involved SS. Thus each multicast MAC SDU is transmitted only once per BS channel.'

If a downlink multicast connection is to be encrypted, each SS participating in the connection shall have an additional security association (SA), allowing that connection to be encrypted using certain keys that are independent of those used for other encrypted transmissions between the SS and BS.'

**Proposed Resolution      Recommendation: Accepted-Modified      Recommendation by**

"In 6.3.13 Multicast and broadcast services (MBS), page 152, lines 37-55, replace as:]

'6.3.13 Multicast and broadcast services (MBS)

Some globally defined service flows may carry broadcast or multicast information that should be delivered to a plurality of SS or MS. Such service flows have certain QoS parameters and may require encryption performed using a globally defined sequence of TEKs. Since a multicast or broadcast transport connection is associated with a service flow, it is associated with the QoS and traffic parameters for that service flow. Some MS are registered to certain BS while some are in Idle mode and not currently served by any specific BS.

Two types of access to multicast and broadcast services (MBS) may be supported: single-BS access and multi-BS access. Single-BS access is implemented over multicast and broadcast transport connections within one BS, while multi-BS access is implemented by transmitting data from Service Flow(s) over multiple BS. Single-BS access **and Multi-BS access is are** optional for SS. Multi-BS access is optional for MS. ARQ is not applicable to either single-BS-MBS or multi-BS-MBS. Initiation of MBS with respect to specific SS or MS is always performed in registered state by creation of multicast connection carrying MBS data. During such initiation the SS or MS learns the Service Flow ID that identifies the service. For multi-BS-MBS, each BS capable of providing MBS belongs to a certain MBS Zone, which is a set of BSs where the same CID and same SA is used for transmitting content of certain Service Flow(s). MBS Zone is identified by a unique MBS\_ZONE identifier.'

[In 6.3.13.1 Single-BS Access, page 152, line 60 through page 153, line 6, replace as:]

'The BS may provide to SS single-BS access by creating a multicast traffic connection with each SS to be associated with the service, or a broadcast transport connection. Any available traffic CID value may be used for the single-BS-MBS service. The CID used for the service is the same for all SS on the same channel that participate in the connection. The data transmitted on the connection with the given CID shall be received and processed by the MAC of each involved SS. Thus each multicast MAC SDU is transmitted only once per BS channel.'

If a downlink multicast connection is to be encrypted, each SS participating in the connection shall have an additional security association (SA), allowing that connection to be encrypted using certain keys that are independent of those used for other encrypted transmissions between the SS and BS.'"

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

“In 6.3.13 Multicast and broadcast services (MBS), page 152, lines 37-55, replace as:]

'6.3.13 Multicast and broadcast services (MBS)

Some globally defined service flows may carry broadcast or multicast information that should be delivered to a plurality of SS or MS. Such service flows have certain QoS parameters and may require encryption performed using a globally defined sequence of TEKs. Since a multicast or broadcast transport connection is associated with a service flow, it is associated with the QoS and traffic parameters for that service flow. Some MS are registered to certain BS while some are in Idle mode and not currently served by any specific BS.

Two types of access to multicast and broadcast services (MBS) may be supported: single-BS access and multi-BS access. Single-BS access is implemented over multicast and broadcast transport connections within one BS, while multi-BS access is implemented by transmitting data from Service Flow(s) over multiple BS. Single-BS access and Multi-BS access is are optional for SS. Multi-BS access is optional for MS. ARQ is not applicable to either single-BS-MBS or multi-BS-MBS. Initiation of MBS with respect to specific SS or MS is always performed in registered state by creation of multicast connection carrying MBS data. During such initiation the SS or MS learns the Service Flow ID that identifies the service. For multi-BS-MBS, each BS capable of providing MBS belongs to a certain MBS Zone, which is a set of BSs where the same CID and same SA is used for transmitting content of certain Service Flow(s). MBS Zone is identified by a unique MBS\_ZONE identifier.'

[In 6.3.13.1 Single-BS Access, page 152, line 60 through page 153, line 6, replace as:]

'The BS may provide to SS single-BS access by creating a multicast traffic connection with each SS to be associated with the service, or a broadcast transport connection. Any available traffic CID value may be used for the single-BS-MBS service. The CID used for the service is the same for all SS on the same channel that participate in the connection. The data transmitted on the connection with the given CID shall be received and processed by the MAC of each involved SS. Thus each multicast MAC SDU is transmitted only once per BS channel.

If a downlink multicast connection is to be encrypted, each SS participating in the connection shall have an additional security association (SA), allowing that connection to be encrypted using certain keys that are independent of those used for other encrypted transmissions between the SS and BS.'”

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5222**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type <b>Editorial</b>	Starting Page # <b>153</b>	Starting Line # <b>26</b>	Fig/Table#	Section <b>6.3.13.2</b>
<b>typo</b>					

Suggested Remedy

**change "Multi-B" to "Multi-BS"**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**change "Multi-B" to "Multi-BS"**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5223**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **154**

Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.13.2.1**

In the same multicast and broadcast service zone, mapping of multicast and broadcast service flow IDs to CIDs shall be known to all BSs, not just "may".

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the sentence to:

Mapping of multicast and broadcast service flow IDs to CIDs ~~may~~ **shall** be known to all BSs belong to the same multicast and broadcast service zone.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change the sentence to:

Mapping of multicast and broadcast service flow IDs to CIDs ~~may~~ **shall** be known to all BSs belong to the same multicast and broadcast service zone.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change the sentence to:

Mapping of multicast and broadcast service flow IDs to CIDs ~~may~~ **shall** be known to all BSs belong to the same multicast and broadcast service zone.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5224**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **154** Starting Line # **64**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.13.2.4**

what's a virtual connection? Not defined in the current spec.

**Suggested Remedy**  
Defined it or delete it.

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

Change text as follows:  
"... connection or a virtual connection defined by MBS Contents Identifier to monitor ..."

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change text as follows:  
"... connection or a virtual connection defined by MBS Contents Identifier to monitor ..."

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5225**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **157** Starting Line # **41** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.14**  
 Maximum Latency clarification

The Maximum latency parameter should reflect the MAC/PHY latency requirements and not the E2E one.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Make the following changes to Section 6.3.14 Maximum latency]*

~~The value of this parameter specifies the maximum latency between the reception of a packet into the network gateway or boundary network interface and the forwarding of the packet to its destination interface. If defined, this parameter represents a service commitment (or admission criteria) and shall be guaranteed. A network does not have to meet this service commitment for service flows that exceed their DL Minimum reserved traffic rate. A value of zero for Maximum latency shall be interpreted as infinite tolerance—timing insensitive traffic.~~

The value of this parameter specifies the maximum interval between the reception of a packet at CS of BS or SS and the arrival of the packet to the peer device.

If defined, this parameter represents a service commitment and shall be guaranteed.

A value of zero for Maximum latency shall be interpreted as no commitment.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[Make the following changes to Section 6.3.14 Maximum latency]*

~~The value of this parameter specifies the maximum latency between the reception of a packet into the network gateway or boundary network interface and the forwarding of the packet to its destination interface. If defined, this parameter represents a service commitment (or admission criteria) and shall be guaranteed. A network does not have to meet this service commitment for service flows that exceed their DL Minimum reserved traffic rate. A value of zero for Maximum latency shall be interpreted as infinite tolerance—timing insensitive traffic.~~

The value of this parameter specifies the maximum interval between the reception of a packet at CS of BS or SS and the arrival of the packet to the peer device.

If defined, this parameter represents a service commitment and shall be guaranteed.

A value of zero for Maximum latency shall be interpreted as no commitment.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[Make the following changes to Section 6.3.14 Maximum latency]*

~~The value of this parameter specifies the maximum latency between the reception of a packet into the network gateway or boundary network interface and the forwarding of the packet to its destination interface. If defined, this parameter represents a service commitment (or admission~~

~~criteria) and shall be guaranteed. A network does not have to meet this service commitment for service flows that exceed their DL Minimum reserved traffic rate. A value of zero for Maximum latency shall be interpreted as infinite tolerance—timing insensitive traffic.~~

~~The value of this parameter specifies the maximum interval between the reception of a packet at CS of BS or SS and the arrival of the packet to the peer device.~~

~~If defined, this parameter represents a service commitment and shall be guaranteed.~~

~~A value of zero for Maximum latency shall be interpreted as no commitment.~~

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5226**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	158	Starting Line #	34	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.17
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------

I object to the resolution of comment 4424 & 4001.

While the resolution of 4424 repairs some of the problems with changes proposed in 6.3.17, it does not adequately repair the underlying problem that the proposed changes to 6.3.17 in the 16e/D8 DRAFT break backwards compatibility with the 802.16-2004 baseline document and are thus out-of-scope of the 16e PAR. More specifically, 6.3.17 in the 802.16-2004 document specifies the mechanics for a HARQ mechanism that is Incremental Redundancy (IR) and per-terminal. There is certainly nothing wrong with adding a new Chase Combining HARQ method. Even better, making it per-connection instead of per-terminal. However, legacy SS are going to be expecting their enabled HARQ to be IR and per-terminal. The current language revisions in 16e/D8 inappropriately change the base document as to make D8 not backwards compatible; would require legacy SS to retroactively support per-connection and Chase Combining HARQ.

Also, changing out the text here to expand the feature to include MBS has resulted in a couple of troubling consequences: 1) the language is now MS specific in places; 2) reference to support 802.16-2004 SS has been inappropriately obscured, breaking backwards compatibility with the 802.16-2004 baseline document, thus out-of-scope of the 16e PAR.

Fortunately, some editorial revision to the section can remedy this problem and bring the section back into conformance with the 16e PAR, while preserving the new features and mechanics.

When reviewing the proposed remedy it is important to remember that an MS is always also an SS unless specifically excepted otherwise.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 158, lines 34-42, modify as:]*

'Hybrid automatic repeat request (~~H-ARQ~~HARQ) scheme is an optional part of the MAC ~~and can be enabled on a per-terminal basis~~. H-ARQ may be supported only for the OFDMA PHY. ~~As a MS capability, The per-terminal H-ARQ~~HARQ and associated parameters shall be specified and negotiated using SBC-REQ/RSP messages during initialization procedure. ~~The utilization of HARQ is on a per-connection basis, that is, it can be enabled on a per-CID basis by using the DSA/DSC messages.~~ Two implementations of HARQ are supported: 1) per-terminal, that is, HARQ is enabled for all active CIDs for a terminal, and 2) per-connection, that is, it can be enabled on a per CID basis by using the DSA/DSC messages. ~~The two implementation methods shall not be employed simultaneously on any terminal. SS may support per-terminal implementation. MS may support per-terminal implementation or per-connection implementation.~~ A burst cannot have a mixture of ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ and non-~~H-ARQ~~HARQ traffic.'

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 159, lines 13-25, modify as:]*

'Two main variants of HARQ are supported, Chase Combining or Incremental Redundancy (IR). ~~SS may support IR. MS may support Chase Combining or IR.~~ For IR, the PHY layer will encode the HARQ packet generating several versions of encoded subpackets. Each subpacket shall be uniquely identified using a subpacket identifier (SPID). For Chase Combining, the PHY layer shall encode the HARQ packet generating only one version of the encoded packet. As a result, no SPID is required for Chase Combining.

For downlink HARQ operation, the BS will send a version of the encoded HARQ packet. ~~The MS SS~~ will attempt to decode the encoded packet on this first HARQ attempt. If the decoding succeeds, ~~the MS SS~~ will send an ACK to the BS. If the decoding fails, ~~the MS SS~~ will send a NAK to the BS. In response, the BS will send another HARQ attempt. The BS may continue to send HARQ attempts until ~~the MS SS~~ successfully decodes the packet and sends an acknowledgement.'

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 159, lines 45-53, modify as:]*

'The ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ scheme is basically a stop-and-wait protocol where the retransmissions are only sent after receiving a NACK signal for the previous transmission or the ACK has not been received within the duration defined by "HARQ ACK Delay for UL burst" for UL HARQ or in "HARQ ACK delay for DL burst" for DL HARQ. The ACK is sent by the ~~MS~~SS after a fixed delay (synchronous ACK) defined by ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ DL ACK delay offset which is specified in DCD message. Timing of retransmission is, however, flexible and corresponds to the asynchronous part of the ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ. The ACK/NAK is sent by the BS using the ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ Bitmap IE, and sent by a ~~MS~~SS using the fast feedback UL subchannel.'

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 158, lines 34-42, modify as:]*

'Hybrid automatic repeat request (~~H-ARQ~~HARQ) scheme is an optional part of the MAC ~~and can be enabled on a per-terminal basis.~~ H-ARQ may be supported only for the OFDMA PHY. ~~As a MS capability, The per-terminal H-ARQ~~HARQ and associated parameters shall be specified and negotiated using SBC-REQ/RSP messages during initialization procedure. The utilization of HARQ is on a per-connection basis, that is, it can be enabled on a per CID basis by using the DSA messages. A burst cannot have a mixture of ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ and non-~~H-ARQ~~HARQ traffic.'

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 159, lines 13-25, modify as:]*

'Two main variants of HARQ are supported, Chase Combining or Incremental Redundancy (IR). ~~SS may support IR. MS may support either Chase Combining or IR.~~ For IR, the PHY layer will encode the HARQ packet generating several versions of encoded subpackets. Each subpacket shall be uniquely identified using a subpacket identifier (SPID). For Chase Combining, the PHY layer shall encode the HARQ packet generating only one version of the encoded packet. As a result, no SPID is required for Chase Combining.

For downlink HARQ operation, the BS will send a version of the encoded HARQ packet. The ~~MS~~SS will attempt to decode the encoded packet on this first HARQ attempt. If the decoding succeeds, the ~~MS~~SS will send an ACK to the BS. If the decoding fails, the ~~MS~~SS will send a NAK to the BS. In response, the BS will send another HARQ attempt. The BS may continue to send HARQ attempts until the ~~MS~~SS successfully decodes the packet and sends an acknowledgement.

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 159, lines 45-53, modify as:]*

'The ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ scheme is basically a stop-and-wait protocol where the retransmissions are only sent after receiving a NACK signal for the previous transmission or the ACK has not been received within the duration defined by "HARQ ACK Delay for UL burst" for UL HARQ or in "HARQ ACK delay for DL burst" for DL HARQ. The ACK is sent by the ~~MS~~SS after a fixed delay (synchronous ACK) defined by ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ DL ACK delay offset which is specified in DCD message. Timing of retransmission is, however, flexible and corresponds to the asynchronous part of the ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ. The ACK/NAK is sent by the BS using the ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ Bitmap IE, and sent by a ~~MS~~SS using the fast feedback UL subchannel.'

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 158, lines 34-42, modify as:]*

'Hybrid automatic repeat request (~~H-ARQ~~HARQ) scheme is an optional part of the MAC ~~and can be enabled on a per-terminal basis.~~ H-ARQ may be supported only for the OFDMA PHY. ~~As a MS capability, The per-terminal H-ARQ~~HARQ and associated parameters shall be specified and negotiated using SBC-REQ/RSP messages during initialization procedure. The utilization of HARQ is on a per-connection basis, that is, it can be enabled on a per CID basis by using the DSA messages. A burst cannot have a mixture of ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ and non-~~H-ARQ~~HARQ traffic.'

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 159, lines 13-25, modify as:]*

'Two main variants of HARQ are supported, Chase Combining or Incremental Redundancy (IR). ~~SS may support IR. MS may support either Chase Combining or IR.~~ For IR, the PHY layer will encode the HARQ packet generating several versions of encoded subpackets. Each subpacket

shall be uniquely identified using a subpacket identifier (SPID). For Chase Combining, the PHY layer shall encode the HARQ packet generating only one version of the encoded packet. As a result, no SPID is required for Chase Combining.

For downlink HARQ operation, the BS will send a version of the encoded HARQ packet. The ~~MS\_SS~~ will attempt to decode the encoded packet on this first HARQ attempt. If the decoding succeeds, the ~~MS\_SS~~ will send an ACK to the BS. If the decoding fails, the ~~MS\_SS~~ will send a NAK to the BS. In response, the BS will send another HARQ attempt. The BS may continue to send HARQ attempts until the ~~MS\_SS~~ successfully decodes the packet and sends an acknowledgement.'

*[In 6.3.17 MAC support for H-ARQ, page 159, lines 45-53, modify as:]*

'The ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ scheme is basically a stop-and-wait protocol where the retransmissions are only sent after receiving a NACK signal for the previous transmission or the ACK has not been received within the duration defined by "HARQ ACK Delay for UL burst" for UL HARQ or in "HARQ ACK delay for DL burst" for DL HARQ. The ACK is sent by the ~~MSS~~ after a fixed delay (synchronous ACK) defined by ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ DL ACK delay offset which is specified in DCD message. Timing of retransmission is, however, flexible and corresponds to the asynchronous part of the ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ. The ACK/NAK is sent by the BS using the ~~H-ARQ~~HARQ Bitmap IE, and sent by a ~~MSS~~ using the fast feedback UL subchannel.'

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5227**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **158**

Starting Line # **37**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.17**

Typo

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:  
"the per-terminal HARQ"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text as follows:  
"the per-terminal HARQ"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

Fixed by another comment.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5228**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **158** Starting Line # **40** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.17**  
The standard does not provide a description of an "initialitization procedure". SBC-REQ/RSP mechanism is used during network entry (and re-entry).

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"... shall be specified and negotiated using SBC-REQ/RSP messages during ~~initialitization-network entry or re-entry~~ procedure."

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change text as follows:

"... shall be specified and negotiated using SBC-REQ/RSP messages during ~~initialitization-network entry or re-entry~~ procedure."

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"... shall be specified and negotiated using SBC-REQ/RSP messages during ~~initialitization-network entry or re-entry~~ procedure."

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5229**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **158**

Starting Line # **41**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.17**

Typo: "messsages" -> "messages"

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:  
"messsages"

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change text as follows:  
"messsages"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5230**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **159**

Starting Line # **55**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.17**

**grammar**

**Suggested Remedy**

**change "per a connection" to "per connection"**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Accepted****

**change "per a connection" to "per connection"**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5231**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	163	6		6.3.19.1.2

DVJ60(subclause=6.3.19.1.2,page=163,line=6):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Service

==&gt;

service

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Service

==&gt;

service

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5232**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	163	11		6.3.19.1.2

DVJ59(subclause=6.3.19.1.2,page=163,line=11):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Service Parameters

==>

service parameters

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Service Parameters

==>

service parameters

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5233**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ61(subclause=6.3.19.1.3,page=163,line=38): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	163	38		6.3.19.1.3

**Suggested Remedy**

Service

==&gt;

service

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Service

==&gt;

service

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5234**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ62(subclause=6.3.19.1.3,page=163,line=44): Inonsistent capitalization, subclause and table title. ==> Make them consistent.**

Starting Page # **163** Starting Line # **44**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.19.1.3**

Suggested Remedy  
**NoRemedySupplied**

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **) none needed**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5235**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	164	13		6.3.19.1.4

DVJ63(subclause=6.3.19.1.4,page=164,line=13):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Service

==>

service

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Service

==>

service

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5236**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	164	Starting Line #	18	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.19.1.4
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

DVJ64(subclause=6.3.19.1.4,page=164,line=18):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Service Parameters

==&gt;

service parameters

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Service Parameters

==&gt;

service parameters

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5237**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	164	35		6.3.19.1.5

DVJ65(subclause=6.3.19.1.5,page=164,line=35):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Service Parameters

==>

service parameters

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Service Parameters

==>

service parameters

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5238**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**  
grammar

Starting Page # **165**

Starting Line # **63**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.20.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

insert "the" before the "following".

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

insert "the" before the "following".

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5239**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type <b>Technical, Non-binding</b>	Starting Page # <b>166</b>	Starting Line # <b>13</b>	Fig/Table#	Section <b>6.3.20.1</b>
---------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	------------	-------------------------

There is no example of Sleep Mode in Annex E.

**Suggested Remedy**

**Remove**

~~"For an example of sleep mode operation, see Annex E."~~

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation: Accepted-Modified</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
<b>Change Annex E to Annex C.</b>		

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified</b>
<b>Change Annex E to Annex C.</b>	

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5240**

Comment submitted by: **Victor**

**Stolpman**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding** Starting Page # **166** Starting Line # **13**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.20.1**

[Wrong reference to Annex E. Sleep mode is described in Annex C.2](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Change Annex E to Annex C.](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5239](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [1\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5241**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	166	Starting Line #	50	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.20.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	----------

DVJ66(subclause=6.3.20.1,page=166,line=50):  
 Capitalization within figure titles should be  
 limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Example of Sleep Mode Operations with two  
 Power Saving Classes

==&gt;

Example of sleep mode operations with two  
 power saving classes

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Example of Sleep Mode Operations with two  
 Power Saving Classes

==&gt;

Example of sleep mode operations with two  
 power saving classes

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5242**

Comment submitted by: Mo-Han

Fong

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **167** Starting Line # **6** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.20.2**

I oppose to the text change in sections 6.3.20.2, 6.3.20.3, and 6.3.20.3, because some text clean-up is required to include the description of sleep control header/subheader on these sections.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Make the following text change on page 167, lines 5-12]*

For definition and/or activation of one or several Power Saving Classes of Type 1 the MS shall send MOB\_SLP-REQ or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header (for activation only); the BS shall respond with an MOB-SLP\_RSP message or DL Sleep control Extended subheader. The MS may retransmit MOB\_SLP-REQ message if it does not receive the MOB-SLP\_RSP message within the T30 T43 timer.

Alternatively Power Saving Class may be defined/activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-RSP message ~~or by Sleep Signaling Header MOB\_SLP-DLC or MOB\_SLP\_ULG.~~

*[Make the following text change on page 167, lines 49-50]*

Power Saving Class is deactivated either by MOB\_SLP-REQ/Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header or MOB\_SLP-RSP/DL Sleep control Extended subheader. messages or (if Traffic triggered waking flag = 1) after one of following events:

*[Make the following text change on page 168, lines 17-24]*

Power Saving Classes of this type are defined/activated/deactivated by MOB\_SLPREQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader transaction. The MS may retransmit MOB-SLP-REQ message or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header if it does not receive the MOB-SLP-RSP message or DL Sleep control Extended subheader within the T43 timer. The BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP or DL Sleep control Extended subheader to initiate activation of Power Saving Class. Once started, the active state continues until explicit termination by MOB\_SLP-REQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP messages or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader. BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP message or DL Sleep control Extended subheader to deactivate Power Saving Class. Alternatively Power Saving Class of type 2 may be defined and/or activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-REQ and RNG-RSP message.

*Make the following text change on page 168, lines 37-44]*

Power Saving Class of this type is recommended for multicast connections as well as for management operations, for example, Periodic Ranging, DSx operations, MOB\_NBR-ADV etc. Power Saving Classes of this type are defined/activated by MOB\_SLP-REQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader transaction. The MS may retransmit MOB\_SLP-REQ message or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header if it does not receive the MOB-SLP-RSP message within the T43 timer. The BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP or DL Sleep control Extended subheader to initiate activation of Power Saving Class. Deactivation of Power Saving Class occurs automatically after expiration of sleep window.

*[Make the following text change on page 167, lines 5-12]*

For definition and/or activation of one or several Power Saving Classes of Type 1 the MS shall send MOB\_SLP-REQ or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header (for activation only); the BS shall respond with an MOB-SLP\_RSP message or DL Sleep control Extended subheader. The MS may retransmit MOB\_SLP-REQ message if it does not receive the MOB-SLP\_RSP message within the T30 T43 timer.

Alternatively Power Saving Class may be defined/activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-RSP message ~~or by Sleep Signaling Header MOB\_SLP-DLC or MOB\_SLP\_ULG.~~

*[Make the following text change on page 167, lines 49-50]*

Power Saving Class is deactivated either by MOB\_SLP-REQ/Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header or MOB\_SLP-RSP/DL Sleep control Extended subheader. messages or (if Traffic triggered waking flag = 1) after one of following events:

*[Make the following text change on page 168, lines 17-24]*

Power Saving Classes of this type are defined/activated/deactivated by MOB\_SLPREQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader transaction. The MS may retransmit MOB-SLP-REQ message or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header if it does not receive the MOB-SLP-RSP message or DL Sleep control Extended subheader within the T43 timer. The BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP or DL Sleep control Extended subheader to initiate activation of Power Saving Class. Once started, the active state continues until explicit termination by MOB\_SLP-REQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP messages or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader. BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP message or DL Sleep control Extended subheader to deactivate Power Saving Class. Alternatively Power Saving Class of type 2 may be defined and/or activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-REQ and RNG-RSP message.

*Make the following text change on page 168, lines 37-44]*

Power Saving Class of this type is recommended for multicast connections as well as for management operations, for example, Periodic Ranging, DSx operations, MOB\_NBR-ADV etc. Power Saving Classes of this type are defined/activated by MOB\_SLP-REQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader transaction. The MS may retransmit MOB\_SLP-REQ message or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header if it does not receive the MOB-SLP-RSP message within the T43 timer. The BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP or DL Sleep control Extended subheader to initiate activation of Power Saving Class. Deactivation of Power Saving Class occurs automatically after expiration of sleep window.

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

*[Make the following text change on page 167, lines 5-12]*

For definition and/or activation of one or several Power Saving Classes of Type 1 the MS shall send MOB\_SLP-REQ or Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header (for activation only); the BS shall respond with an MOB-SLP\_RSP message or DL Sleep control Extended subheader. The MS may retransmit MOB\_SLP-REQ message if it does not receive the MOB-SLP\_RSP message within the T30 T43 timer.

Alternatively Power Saving Class may be defined/activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-RSP

message or by Sleep Signaling Header MOB\_SLP-DLC or MOB\_SLP\_ULG.

*[Make the following text change on page 167, lines 49-50]*

Power Saving Class is deactivated either by MOB\_SLP-REQ/[Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header](#) or MOB\_SLP-RSP/[DL Sleep control Extended subheader](#). messages or (if Traffic triggered waking flag = 1) after one of following events:

*[Make the following text change on page 168, lines 17-24]*

Power Saving Classes of this type are defined/activated/deactivated by MOB\_SLPREQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP or [Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader](#) transaction. The MS may retransmit MOB-SLP-REQ message or [Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header](#) if it does not receive the MOB-SLP-RSP message or [DL Sleep control Extended subheader](#) within the T43 timer. The BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP or [DL Sleep control Extended subheader](#) to initiate activation of Power Saving Class. Once started, the active state continues until explicit termination by MOB\_SLP-REQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP messages or [Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader](#). BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP message or [DL Sleep control Extended subheader](#) to deactivate Power Saving Class. Alternatively Power Saving Class of type 2 may be defined and/or activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-REQ and RNG-RSP message.

*Make the following text change on page 168, lines 37-44]*

Power Saving Class of this type is recommended for multicast connections as well as for management operations, for example, Periodic Ranging, DSx operations, MOB\_NBR-ADV etc. Power Saving Classes of this type are defined/activated by MOB\_SLP-REQ/MOB\_SLP-RSP or [Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header/DL Sleep control Extended subheader](#) transaction. The MS may retransmit MOB\_SLP-REQ message or [Bandwidth request and uplink sleep control header](#) if it does not receive the MOB-SLP-RSP message within the T43 timer. The BS may send unsolicited MOB\_SLP-RSP or [DL Sleep control Extended subheader](#) to initiate activation of Power Saving Class. Deactivation of Power Saving Class occurs automatically after expiration of sleep window.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5243**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	167	Starting Line #	26	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.20.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	----------

DVJ67(subclause=6.3.20.2,page=167,line=26):

Don't use space on subtraction symbols within variable names.

**Suggested Remedy**

Use other variables in equation, define them in terms of English after the equation.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Convert:

"Sleep window = min (2\*(Previous sleep window), Final-sleep window base \* 2 ^ (Final-sleep window exponent))"  
to a proper equation, assign suitable variable names and include a description of the variable names used.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Convert:

"Sleep window = min (2\*(Previous sleep window), Final-sleep window base \* 2 ^ (Final-sleep window exponent))"  
to a proper equation, assign suitable variable names and include a description of the variable names used.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5244**

Comment submitted by: Ron

Murias

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **168** Starting Line # **31** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.3.58**

Power control mode change request (PMC\_REQ) does not necessarily apply only to the OFDMA PHY mode.

**Suggested Remedy**

~~This subclause is applied only to OFDMA PHY mode.~~ The decision of the change of the power control mode between the open loop power control and closed loop power control is done at BS and the decision is indicated by the PMC\_RSP MAC message.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

In 6.3.2.3.58 Power control mode change request (PMC\_REQ) message, page 142, line 37, the invoking paragraph states, 'The closed and open loop power control scheme are described in 8.4.10.3.'

That language would have to change and an appropriate section added to other PHYs for this message to apply to other PHY types.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5245**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **169** Starting Line # **20** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.20.4**

The draft claims that power saving class of type 3 may be activated/deactivated by TLVs that are transmitted in DBPC-RSP messages. However, the required TLVs for that are not defined.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"Alternatively Power Saving Class of type 3 may be activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-RSP~~or DBPC-RSP~~ messages."

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change text as follows:

"Alternatively Power Saving Class of type 3 may be activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-RSP~~or DBPC-RSP~~ messages."

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"Alternatively Power Saving Class of type 3 may be activated /deactivated by TLVs transmitted in RNG-RSP~~or DBPC-RSP~~ messages."

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5246**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **170** Starting Line # **4**Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21**

I object to the resolution of the comment 2086.

Problem: HO process (mobility) should be a mandatory feature for mobile systems. Despite the addition of many new features, mobility is the core reason for the 16e document to exist. Having mobility be optional for MS is ludicrous. Unfortunately we have only previously implied that mobility support is a requirement in the document. We have never overtly stated the fact--until now.

Change language to make some type of HO support mandatory.

Also, the section could use some wordsmithing.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[In 6.3.21, page 170, line 6-17, replace as:]*

MSS shall use the HO process defined in this section to conduct HO:

- when the MS moves and, due to a variety of confounding RF performance factors (signal fading, interference levels, etc...), may benefit from changing the serving BS to which it is currently connected to another neighbor BS on the operator network that may provide the MS a more reliable or higher performing connection;

- when the MS can be serviced with higher QoS at another BS and/or the network can more efficiently distribute MS air interface loading.

The handover decision algorithm is beyond the scope of the standard.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

*[In 6.3.21, page 170, line 6, insert the following text:]*

An MS shall be capable of performing handover using the procedures defined in 6.3.21.2.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*[In 6.3.21, page 170, line 6, insert the following text:]*

An MS shall be capable of performing handover using the procedures defined in 6.3.21.2.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5247**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ68(subclause=6.3.21.1.2,page=170,line=33): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	170	33		6.3.21.1.2

**Suggested Remedy**

Scanning of  
==>  
scanning of

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Scanning of  
==>  
scanning of

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5248**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	170	Starting Line #	37	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.1.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

DVJ69(subclause=6.3.21.1.2,page=170,line=37):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Scanning Interval.

==>

scanning interval.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Scanning Interval.

==>

scanning interval.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5249**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	170	44		6.3.21.1.2

DVJ70(subclause=6.3.21.1.2,page=170,line=44):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Interval and Interleaving  
==>  
interval and interleaving

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Interval and Interleaving  
==>  
interval and interleaving

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5250**

Comment submitted by: Mo-Han

Fong

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	171	Starting Line #	14	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.1.2
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

I object to the text change in D8 related to the Association Procedure in Section 6.3.21.1.3, because some text clean-up and clarification is required.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Make the following text change on page 171, line 10-17, because the initial ranging description is the same of association level 0, therefore should be covered in the scanning section]*

Following reception of a MOB\_SCN-RSP message granting the request, beginning at Start frame an MS may scan for one or more BS during the time interval allocated in the message. When a BS is identified through scanning, the MS may attempt to synchronize with its downlink transmissions, and estimate the quality of the PHY channel. ~~MS may also perform contention, or non-contention if available, based initial ranging during the Scanning Interval to more completely evaluate PHY channel characteristics with the BS, obtain Service Level Predictions.~~

*[Make the following text change on page 108, lines 60-63]*

The Recommended BS is expected to provide non-contention based Ranging opportunity ~~within 5 frames interval starting from~~ at the frame specified by Rendezvous time parameter.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

*[Make the following text change on page 171, line 10-17, because the initial ranging description is the same of association level 0, therefore should be covered in the scanning section]*

Following reception of a MOB\_SCN-RSP message granting the request, beginning at Start frame an MS may scan for one or more BS during the time interval allocated in the message. When a BS is identified through scanning, the MS may attempt to synchronize with its downlink transmissions, and estimate the quality of the PHY channel. ~~MS may also perform contention, or non-contention if available, based initial ranging during the Scanning Interval to more completely evaluate PHY channel characteristics with the BS, obtain Service Level Predictions.~~

*[Make the following text change on page 108, lines 60-63]*

The Recommended BS is expected to provide non-contention based Ranging opportunity ~~within 5 frames interval starting from~~ at the frame specified by Rendezvous time parameter.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

*[Make the following text change on page 171, line 10-17, because the initial ranging description is the same of association level 0, therefore should be covered in the scanning section]*

Following reception of a MOB\_SCN-RSP message granting the request, beginning at Start frame an MS may scan for one or more BS during the time interval allocated in the message. When a BS is identified through scanning, the MS may attempt to synchronize with its downlink transmissions, and estimate the quality of the PHY channel. ~~MS may also perform contention, or non-contention if available, based initial ranging during the Scanning Interval to more completely evaluate PHY channel characteristics with the BS, obtain Service Level Predictions.~~

*[Make the following text change on page 108, lines 60-63]*

The Recommended BS is expected to provide non-contention based Ranging opportunity ~~within 5 frames interval starting from~~ at the frame specified by Rendezvous time parameter.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5251**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	171	Starting Line #	29	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.1.3
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

DVJ71(subclause=6.3.21.1.3,page=171,line=29):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Procedure

==>

procedure

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**Interval and Interleaving**

==>

interval and interleaving

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5252**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	171	52		6.3.21.1.3

DVJ72(subclause=6.3.21.1.3,page=171,line=52):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Level

==>

level

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Level

==>

level

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5253**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	172	13		6.3.21.1.3.2

DVJ73(subclause=6.3.21.1.3.2,page=172,line=13):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Level  
==>  
level

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Level  
==>  
level

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5254**

Comment submitted by: Mo-Han

Fong

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	172	Starting Line #	27	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.1.3.2
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

I object to the text change corresponding to comment #4196, because some terminology and text clean up is required.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 27-29, because the term ranging window is misleading]*

Each neighboring BS will provide a ranging ~~window~~ region for association at a predefined "rendezvous time", in terms of relative frame number.

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 49-50, because the term ranging window is misleading]*

The ranging ~~window~~ region will be allocated via UIUC=12 in the UL-MAP, when the "Dedicated ranging indicator" bit is set to 1.

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 52-56, because the dedicated CDMA code in MOB-PAG-ADV message is used for both network re-entry and location update]*

When "Dedicated ranging indicator" is set to 1, then the ranging region and ranging method defined shall be used for the purpose of ranging using dedicated CDMA code and transmit opportunity assigned in the MOB-PAG-ADV message (~~for location update in idle mode~~) or in the MOB-SCN-RSP message (for coordinated association).

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 27-29, because the term ranging window is misleading]*

Each neighboring BS will provide a ranging ~~window~~ region for association at a predefined "rendezvous time", in terms of relative frame number.

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 49-50, because the term ranging window is misleading]*

The ranging ~~window~~ region will be allocated via UIUC=12 in the UL-MAP, when the "Dedicated ranging indicator" bit is set to 1.

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 52-56, because the dedicated CDMA code in MOB-PAG-ADV message is used for both network re-entry and location update]*

When "Dedicated ranging indicator" is set to 1, then the ranging region and ranging method defined shall be used for the purpose of ranging using dedicated CDMA code and transmit opportunity assigned in the MOB-PAG-ADV message (~~for location update in idle mode~~) or in the MOB-SCN-RSP message (for coordinated association).

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 27-29, because the term ranging window is misleading]*

Each neighboring BS will provide a ranging ~~window~~ region for association at a predefined "rendezvous time", in terms of relative frame number.

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 49-50, because the term ranging window is misleading]*

The ranging ~~window~~ region will be allocated via UIUC=12 in the UL-MAP, when the "Dedicated ranging indicator" bit is set to 1.

*[Make the following text change on page 172, lines 52-56, because the dedicated CDMA code in MOB-PAG-ADV message is used for both network re-entry and location update]*

When "Dedicated ranging indicator" is set to 1, then the ranging region and ranging method defined shall be used for the purpose of ranging using dedicated CDMA code and transmit opportunity assigned in the MOB-PAG-ADV message (~~for location update in idle mode~~) or in the MOB-SCN-RSP message (for coordinated association).

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5255**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **173** Starting Line # **9**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.1.3.3**

This line should refer to "association level 2" instead of "1".

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"similar to association level **21**."

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change text as follows:

"similar to association level **21**."

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"similar to association level **21**."

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5256**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **173** Starting Line # **49** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2**

Handover process can be based on Initial or Handover Ranging.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"~~Initial~~ Ranging — MS and target BS shall conduct Initial Ranging per 6.3.9.5 or Handover Ranging per 6.3.10.3.3."

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change text as follows:

"~~Initial~~ Ranging — MS and target BS shall conduct Initial Ranging per 6.3.9.5 or Handover Ranging per 6.3.10.3.3."

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"~~Initial~~ Ranging — MS and target BS shall conduct Initial Ranging per 6.3.9.5 or Handover Ranging per 6.3.10.3.3."

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5257**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ74(subclause=6.3.21.2,page=173,line=49): Double numbers**

Starting Page # **173** Starting Line # **49**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2**

Suggested Remedy  
**Fix them.**

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution  
**Comment unclear.**

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **) none needed**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5258**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **173** Starting Line # **57**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2**

Numbering of numbered is wrong (a.o. includes two numbers per line)

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

- \* Remove one level of numbering
- \* Remove line break between "TLV" and "is set)" (number 3 from the numbered list)

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change text as follows:

- \* Remove one level of numbering
- \* Remove line break between "TLV" and "is set)" (number 3 from the numbered list)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5259**Comment submitted by: **Lei****Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **173** Starting Line # **63**Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2**

typo

**Suggested Remedy**

1. append the "is set)" in the previous line
2. delete the item 4)
3. renumber 5) to 4)
4. renumber 6) to 5)

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

1. append the "is set)" in the previous line
2. delete the item 4)
3. renumber 5) to 4)
4. renumber 6) to 5)

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5260**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **174** Starting Line # **1**  
According to description of HO Process Optimization TLV, REG-RSP is skipped if bit #10 is set.

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"Bit #10 in HO Process Optimization TLV is ~~unset~~)"

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Change text as follows:

"Bit #10 in HO Process Optimization TLV is ~~unset~~)"

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"Bit #10 in HO Process Optimization TLV is ~~unset~~)"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5261**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **176** Starting Line # **4**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2.1**

DVJ75(subclause=6.3.21.2.1,page=176,line=4):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Reselection

==>

reselection

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reselection

==>

reselection

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5262**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	176	Starting Line #	16	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.2.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

DVJ76(subclause=6.3.21.2.1,page=176,line=16):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Power On)

==&gt;

power on)

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Power On)

==&gt;

power on)

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5263**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **177** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2.2**

Typo

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text as follows:

"message-s"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text as follows:

"message-s"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5264**

Comment submitted by: Victor

Stolpman

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **178**

Starting Line # **22**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.21.2.4**

The document uses fast\_ranging\_ie elsewhere not fast\_ul\_ranging\_ie

**Suggested Remedy**

Change fast\_ul\_ranging\_ie to fast\_ranging\_ie

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change Fast\_UL\_ranging\_IE() to Fast\_Ranging\_IE

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change Fast\_UL\_ranging\_IE() to Fast\_Ranging\_IE

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5265**

Comment submitted by: Kyungjoo

Suh

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **178** Starting Line # **54** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2.5.**

In the current specification, after SS sends MOB\_HO IND message, it is not clear when is the time for SS to disconnect the communication with old Serving BS. Therefore, in this contribution we clarify the time for SS to be disconnected from the old Serving BS.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/297.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

BS must wait until Resource Retain Timer expires before killing the connections. Other comments improve the language of 6.3.21.2.5.

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

BS must wait until Resource Retain Timer expires before killing the connections. Other comments improve the language of 6.3.21.2.5.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5266**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **179**

Starting Line # **18**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.21.2.6**

We agreed to use CMAC instead of OMAC at the last meeting.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace every "OMAC" with "CMAC" throughout the entire document.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Replace every "OMAC" with "CMAC" throughout the entire document.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5267**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **180**

Starting Line # **41**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.21.2.7**

typo

Suggested Remedy

change "than" to "then"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

change "than" to "then"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5268**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **180** Starting Line # **52** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2.7**  
The text for ordering of New CIDs does not reflect a previously accepted contribution nor does it reflect the text incorporated into §6.3.2.3.52 on page 121.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change sentence to read "... that includes service flow remapping information in SFID, New\_CID, ~~Old\_CID~~ and Connection\_Info TLVs".

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change sentence to read "... that includes service flow remapping information in SFID, New\_CID, ~~Old\_CID~~ and Connection\_Info TLVs".

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change sentence to read "... that includes service flow remapping information in SFID, New\_CID, ~~Old\_CID~~ and Connection\_Info TLVs".

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5269**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **181** Starting Line # **vario** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.2.8**

Another missing command, HO-RSP. This also occurs in Annex C and possibly other places

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "MSS HO-RSP pending" to "MOB\_BSHO-RSP" in this figure as well as in Figures 130d line 50 and in Figure 130e lines 3, 22, and 39.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change instance of 'HO-RSP' to 'MOB\_BSHO-RSP' in figures in this section

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change "MSS HO-RSP pending" to "MOB\_BSHO-RSP" in this figure as well as in Figures 130d line 50 and in Figure 130e lines 3, 22, and 39.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

Could not find "MSS HO-RSP" in Figure 130e line 22; others are done.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5270**Comment submitted by: **Lei****Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **181** Starting Line # **38** Fig/Table# **Fig1** Section

timer T28 is not defined in 802.16-2004 and 16e/D8. But it is defined in cor1/D3. However, the cor1/D3 T28 is used as DBPC-REQ retry timer, which is not the same as the usage in 16e/D8.

**Suggested Remedy**

Define the 16e MOB\_MSSHO-REQ timer.

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Page 181 Figure 130d, change T28 to T41.

In Figure 130e lines 9, 14, 27: change T28 to T41.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Page 181 Figure 130d, change T28 to T41.

In Figure 130e lines 9, 14, 27: change T28 to T41.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions **k) done****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5271**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **182** Starting Line # **26** Fig/Table# **130e** Section **6.3.21.2.8**

The SDL sequence for the make-before-break (MBB) case shows that a MOB\_HO-IND messages is sent after re-entry at the Target BS. This is incorrect according to the procedures described in §6.3.21.2 and as described in §6.3.2.3.55 on page 131, line 33 which states "An MS shall transmit a MOB\_HO-IND message for final indication that it is **about to** perform a HO". Since the MOB\_HO-IND message provides information to the Serving BS related to the handover (and contains no information that is useful to the Target BS), it cannot be sent after the handover.

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the SDL action box labelled "Re-enter network at target BS (MBB)"

Same comment applies to Figure 130f (page 183) and to Figure 130g (page 184).

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Delete the SDL action box labelled "Re-enter network at target BS (MBB)"

Same comment applies to Figure 130f (page 183) and to Figure 130g (page 184).

Additionally to suggested resolution delete all MBB and BBM labels from named figures. There are no terms make-before-break (MBB) and break-before-make in the standard anymore

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Delete the SDL action box labelled "Re-enter network at target BS (MBB)"

Same comment applies to Figure 130f (page 183) and to Figure 130g (page 184).

Additionally to suggested resolution delete all MBB and BBM labels from named figures. There are no terms make-before-break (MBB) and break-before-make in the standard anymore

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5272**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **182** Starting Line # **38** Fig/Table# **130e** Section **6.3.21.2.8**

The SDL sequence for the break-before-make (BBM) case is correct for BBM and MBB cases in that a MOB\_HO-IND messages is sent before re-entry at the Target BS.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the text in the final SDL action box to read "Re-enter network at target BS (~~BBM~~)" since this action is the same for all handover cases.

Same comment applies to Figure 130f (page 183) and to Figure 130g (page 184).

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change the text in the final SDL action box to read "Re-enter network at target BS (~~BBM~~)" since this action is the same for all handover cases.

Same comment applies to Figure 130f (page 183) and to Figure 130g (page 184).

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5271.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5273**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **186** Starting Line # **12** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.3.1**

I object to the text change in D8 on SHO/FBSS because the list of conditions for SHO is incomplete and/or inaccurate. In particular:

- PDUs are not "multicast" -- i.e. they are not sent over multicast CIDs
- the shared context is not detailed.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text to read:

There are several conditions that are required to enable soft handover ~~and or Fast BS Switching handover~~ between MS and a group of BSs.

These conditions are listed below:

- The BSs involved in SHO are synchronized based on a common time source;
- The frames sent by the BSs involved in SHO at a given frame time arrive at the MS within the prefix interval
- BSs involving in SHO have synchronized frame structure
- ~~BSs involving in SHO have level 3 context transfer or sharing~~
- The same MAC/PHY PDUs shall be ~~multicast sent~~ by all the BSs involved in SHO to the MS.
- BSs involved in SHO are also required to share or transfer MAC context. Such context includes all information MS and BS normally exchange during Network Entry, particularly authentication state, so that an MS authenticated / registered with one of BSs from active set BSs is automatically authenticated / registered with other BSs from the same active set. The context includes also set of Service Flows and corresponding mapping to connections associated with MS, current authentication and encryption keys associated with the connections.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Change text to read:

There are several conditions that are required to enable soft handover ~~and or Fast BS Switching handover~~ between MS and a group of BSs. These conditions are listed below:

- The BSs involved in SHO are synchronized based on a common time source;
- The frames sent by the BSs involved in SHO at a given frame time arrive at the MS within the prefix interval
- BSs involving in SHO have synchronized frame structure
- ~~BSs involving in SHO have level 3 context transfer or sharing~~
- The same MAC/PHY PDUs shall be ~~multicast sent~~ by all the BSs involved in SHO to the MS.
- BSs involved in SHO are also required to share or transfer MAC context. Such context includes all information MS and BS normally exchange during Network Entry, particularly authentication state, so that an MS authenticated / registered with one of BSs from active set BSs is automatically authenticated / registered with other BSs from the same active set. The context includes also set of Service Flows and corresponding mapping to connections associated with MS, current authentication and encryption keys associated with the connections.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text to read:

There are several conditions that are required to enable soft handover ~~and or Fast BS Switching handover~~ between MS and a group of BSs. These



conditions are listed below:

- The BSs involved in SHO are synchronized based on a common time source;
- The frames sent by the BSs involved in SHO at a given frame time arrive at the MS within the prefix interval
- BSs involving in SHO have synchronized frame structure
- ~~BSs involving in SHO have level 3 context transfer or sharing~~
- The same MAC/PHY PDUs shall be multicast sent by all the BSs involved in SHO to the MS.
- BSs involved in SHO are also required to share or transfer MAC context. Such context includes all information MS and BS normally exchange during Network Entry, particularly authentication state, so that an MS authenticated / registered with one of BSs from active set BSs is automatically authenticated / registered with other BSs from the same active set. The context includes also set of Service Flows and corresponding mapping to connections associated with MS, current authentication and encryption keys associated with the connections.

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

There is more text in the document than what is shown in this comment. I've only made the changes explicitly shown, and I've left the rest of the text intact.

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5274**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 186 Starting Line # 26 Fig/Table# Section 6.3.21.3.2

DVJ77(subclause=6.3.21.3.2,page=186,line=26):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Decision and Initiation  
==>  
decision and initiation

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Decision and Initiation  
==>  
decision and initiation

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5275**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	187	18		6.3.21.3.3

DVJ78(subclause=6.3.21.3.3,page=187,line=18):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Update  
==>  
update

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Update  
==>  
update

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5276**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	188	Starting Line #	21	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.3.4.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

DVJ79(subclause=6.3.21.3.4.2,page=188,line=21):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Selection Feedback Mechanism  
==>  
selection feedback mechanism

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Selection Feedback Mechanism  
==>  
selection feedback mechanism

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5277**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ80(subclause=6.3.21.3.4.2,page=188,line=43):**  
Need a figure number

Starting Page # **188** Starting Line # **43**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.3.4.2**

Suggested Remedy  
**NoRemedySupplied**

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by  
On page 188 line 49, fix the reference (Figure 130h).

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
On page 188 line 49, fix the reference (Figure 130h).

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5278**

Comment submitted by: David

Castelow

Member

2005/06/08

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Starting Page #</b>	<b>Starting Line #</b>	<b>Fig/Table#</b>	<b>Section</b>
----------------	-------------	------------------------	------------------------	-------------------	----------------

I disagree with the resolution of comment 2177  
TBD!

**Suggested Remedy**

Page 188, Line 49  
 Replace "Figure xxx" with "Figure ????130h"  
 Page 232, Line 4: (fill in please)  
 Replace "as per section XXX." with "as per section XXX."  
 Page 349, line 49:  
 Replace "0b010 = Antenna selection and reduced codebook (see Table xxx of 8.4.5.4.10.3)" with  
 "0b010 = Antenna selection and reduced codebook (see Table 298a??? of 8.4.5.4.10.3)"  
 (Or do you have the wrong section?)  
 Page 535, Line 52  
 Replace "The compound field contains the subattributes as defined in Table xxx."  
 with  
 "The compound field contains the subattributes as defined in Table xxx."  
 Page 540, Line 42,  
 Replace "(see section xx)," with "(see section xx),"

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: Accepted</b>
----------------------------	------------------------------------

Page 188, Line 49  
 Replace "Figure xxx" with "Figure ????130h"  
 Page 232, Line 4: (fill in please)  
 Replace "as per section XXX." with "as per section XXX."  
 Page 349, line 49:  
 Replace "0b010 = Antenna selection and reduced codebook (see Table xxx of 8.4.5.4.10.3)" with  
 "0b010 = Antenna selection and reduced codebook (see Table 298a??? of 8.4.5.4.10.3)"  
 (Or do you have the wrong section?)  
 Page 535, Line 52  
 Replace "The compound field contains the subattributes as defined in Table xxx."  
 with  
 "The compound field contains the subattributes as defined in Table xxx."  
 Page 540, Line 42,  
 Replace "(see section xx)," with "(see section xx),"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions c) instructions unclear

Clear instructions please. I'm not sure what 'Replace "(see section xx)," with "(see section xx)," means.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5279**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 188 Starting Line # 49 Fig/Table# Section 6.3.21.3.4.2

Invalid reference to 'Figure xxx'

Suggested Remedy

Change Figure number as follows:

"Figure~~xxx~~130h"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change Figure number as follows:

"Figure~~xxx~~130h"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5280**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	189	Starting Line #	39	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.3.4.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

DVJ81(subclause=6.3.21.3.4.2,page=189,line=39):  
 Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.  
 This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

ASR Slot After  
 Switch Period  
 ==>  
 ASR slot after  
 switch period

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

ASR Slot After  
 Switch Period  
 ==>  
 ASR slot after  
 switch period

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5281**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	189	Starting Line #	39	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.3.4.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

DVJ82(subclause=6.3.21.3.4.2,page=189,line=39):  
 Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

ASR Slot During  
 Switch Period  
 ==>  
 ASR slot during  
 switch period

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

ASR Slot During  
 Switch Period  
 ==>  
 ASR slot during  
 switch period

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5282**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	189	Starting Line #	39	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.3.4.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

DVJ83(subclause=6.3.21.3.4.2,page=189,line=39):  
 Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

ASR Slot During  
 Switch Period  
 ==>  
 ASR slot during  
 switch period

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

ASR Slot During  
 Switch Period  
 ==>  
 ASR slot during  
 switch period

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5283**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	189	Starting Line #	39	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.3.4.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

DVJ84(subclause=6.3.21.3.4.2,page=189,line=39):  
 Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

Pre-Switch  
 ASR Slot  
 ==>  
 Pre-switch  
 ASR slot

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Pre-Switch  
 ASR Slot  
 ==>  
 Pre-switch  
 ASR slot

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5284**Comment submitted by: **Rajesh****Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **190** Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.3.5**  
 6.3.21.3.5.2 DL transmission operation for regular HO not SHO or FBSS. It should be included with rest of HO sections.

**Suggested Remedy**

Move section 6.3.21.3.5.2, and insert it as a new section in 6.3.21.2 as section 6.3.21.2.8, move the current section 6.3.21.2.8 to 6.3.21.2.9.

Change section 6.3.21.3.5.1 as section 6.3.21.2.5

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Move section 6.3.21.3.5.2, and insert it as a new section in 6.3.21.2 as section 6.3.21.2.8, move the current section 6.3.21.2.8 to 6.3.21.2.9.

Change section 6.3.21.3.5.1 as section 6.3.21.2.5

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Move section 6.3.21.3.5.2, and insert it as a new section in 6.3.21.2 as section 6.3.21.2.8, move the current section 6.3.21.2.8 to 6.3.21.2.9.

Change section 6.3.21.3.5.1 as section 6.3.21.2.5

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

I assume "Change section 6.3.21.3.5.1 as section 6.3.21.2.5" was supposed to be "Change section 6.3.21.3.5.1 as section 6.3.21.3.5" and acted accordingly. If I'm wrong, it's because I'm too tired to know any better.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5285**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	190	Starting Line #	17	Fig/Table#	Section
Language clarification								

**Suggested Remedy**

Change throughout the document

"ARQ based" [connection] to "connecton with ARQ enabled"  
"non-ARQ based" [connection] to "connecton with ARQ disabled"

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Change throughout the document

"ARQ based" [connection] to "connecton with ARQ enabled"  
"non-ARQ based" [connection] to "connecton with ARQ disabled"

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change throughout the document

"ARQ based" [connection] to "connecton with ARQ enabled"  
"non-ARQ based" [connection] to "connecton with ARQ disabled"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5286**

Comment submitted by: **Vladimir**

**Yanover**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type <b>Editorial</b>	Starting Page # <b>190</b>	Starting Line # <b>26</b>	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	------------	---------

Suggested Remedy  
Change

SNSN Feedback

to

SN Feedback

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: <b>Accepted</b>
---------------------	------------------------------------

Change

SNSN Feedback

to

SN Feedback

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions	) none needed
----------------	------------------	---------------

Text is gone.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5287**

Comment submitted by: Mo-Han

Fong

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **190** Starting Line # **46** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.3.5.1**  
 I object to the application of resolution of comment #4127, because the accepted resolution wasn't applied in D8. Also, fix some typo in the text.

**Suggested Remedy***[Modify page 190, lines 46-47 as follows]*

The MSS shall send the sequence number in numerical ascending order of the values of the ~~GIDs~~**SFIDs** values.

*[Modify page 191, lines 32-33 as follows]*

The MSS shall send the sequence number in numerical ascending order of the values of the ~~GIDs~~**SFIDs** values.

*[Modify page 190, line 23-24 as follows]*

The capability and the support for each connection are defined in the RE~~GQ~~**REQ**/RSP and DSA-REQ/RSP TLVs respectively.

*[Modify page 190, line 23-24 as follows]*

For the connections that have ~~SNSN~~ Feedback enabled, the following procedures shall be performed by the BS and the MS:

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by***[Modify page 190, lines 46-47 as follows]*

The MSS shall send the sequence number in numerical ascending order of the values of the ~~GIDs~~**SFIDs** values.

*[Modify page 191, lines 32-33 as follows]*

The MSS shall send the sequence number in numerical ascending order of the values of the ~~GIDs~~**SFIDs** values.

*[Modify page 190, line 23-24 as follows]*

The capability and the support for each connection are defined in the RE~~GQ~~**REQ**/RSP and DSA-REQ/RSP TLVs respectively.

*[Modify page 190, line 23-24 as follows]*

For the connections that have ~~SNSN~~ Feedback enabled, the following procedures shall be performed by the BS and the MS:

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted***[Modify page 190, lines 46-47 as follows]*

The MSS shall send the sequence number in numerical ascending order of the values of the ~~GIDs~~SFIDs values.

*[Modify page 191, lines 32-33 as follows]*

The MSS shall send the sequence number in numerical ascending order of the values of the ~~GIDs~~SFIDs values.

*[Modify page 190, line 23-24 as follows]*

The capability and the support for each connection are defined in the ~~REQ~~REQ-REQ/RSP and DSA-REQ/RSP TLVs respectively.

*[Modify page 190, line 23-24 as follows]*

For the connections that have ~~SNSN~~SNSN Feedback enabled, the following procedures shall be performed by the BS and the MS:

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5288**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **190** Starting Line # **47** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.21.3.5.1**

The text for ordering of sequence numbers does not reflect a previously accepted contribution nor does it reflect the text incorporated into §6.3.2.1.2.1.7 on page 25.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change sentence to read "The MS shall send the sequence numbers in numerical ascending order of the values of the ~~GH~~ SFID values".

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Change sentence to read "The MS shall send the sequence numbers in numerical ascending order of the values of the ~~GH~~ SFID values".

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5287

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5289**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Language clarification	Technical, Non-binding	191	9		

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

~~For the connections that have SN Feedback enabled with ARQ not enabled, the following procedures shall be performed by the BS and the MS:~~

~~—For ARQ connections, the ARQ block sequence number is already available at the MS.~~

~~—For non-ARQ connections with SN Feedback enabled, the old Serving BS shall include a SDU SN Extended subheader at least once every 2<sup>p</sup> MAC PDUs, where p is specified in the SN Feedback support TLV (11.7.8.9).~~

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change

~~For the connections that have SN Feedback enabled with ARQ not enabled, the following procedures shall be performed by the BS and the MS:~~

~~—For ARQ connections, the ARQ block sequence number is already available at the MS.~~

~~—For non-ARQ connections with SN Feedback enabled, the old Serving BS shall include a SDU SN Extended subheader at least once every 2<sup>p</sup> MAC PDUs, where p is specified in the SN Feedback support TLV (11.7.8.9).~~

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change

~~For the connections that have SN Feedback enabled with ARQ not enabled, the following procedures shall be performed by the BS and the MS:~~

~~—For ARQ connections, the ARQ block sequence number is already available at the MS.~~

~~—For non-ARQ connections with SN Feedback enabled, the old Serving BS shall include a SDU SN Extended subheader at least once every 2<sup>p</sup> MAC PDUs, where p is specified in the SN Feedback support TLV (11.7.8.13).~~

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5290**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	191	Starting Line #	27	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------

Definition of BS action is absent (after SN update received)

**Suggested Remedy**  
Change

-----

Upon completion of HO and NW re-entry, the Target BS (now new Serving BS) should provide UL allocation assign UL resource for the MS sufficient for transmission of SN Report MAC header with to transmit the LSBs of the sequence number(s) of ARQ block or virtual MAC SDU on the SN Report MAC header. After reception of SN Report MAC header BS shall resume transmission of the data of the corresponding DL Service Flow starting from MAC SDUs data units pointed by the sequence number.

-----

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**      **Recommendation by**  
Change

-----

Upon completion of HO and NW re-entry, the Target BS (now new Serving BS) should provide UL allocation assign UL resource for the MS sufficient for transmission of SN Report MAC header with to transmit the LSBs of the sequence number(s) of ARQ block or virtual MAC SDU on the SN Report MAC header. After reception of SN Report MAC header BS shall resume transmission of the data of the corresponding DL Service Flow starting from MAC SDUs pointed by the sequence number.

-----

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**  
Change

-----

Upon completion of HO and NW re-entry, the Target BS (now new Serving BS) should provide UL allocation assign UL resource for the MS sufficient for transmission of SN Report MAC header with to transmit the LSBs of the sequence number(s) of ARQ block or virtual MAC SDU on the SN Report MAC header. After reception of SN Report MAC header BS shall resume transmission of the data of the corresponding DL Service Flow starting from MAC SDUs pointed by the sequence number.

-----

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

**Group's Notes**  
**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** k) done

Dire warning: this text was changed by at least 2 other comments. I did my best, but feel free to fire at will.

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5291**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **191** Starting Line # **33** Fig/Table# Section

As specified in 6.3.2.1.2.1.7, sequence numbers appear in SN Report Header in the order of SFIDs

**Suggested Remedy**

Change:

-----

The MS subsequently sends up to two SN Report MAC headers that include the next ARQ Block (or virtual MAC SDU) sequence number that it is expecting to receive from BS for each of its connections that have SN feedback enabled. The MS shall send the sequence numbers in numerical ascending order of the SFID values of the CIDs values.

-----

Same change should be done at page 190 line 46

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change:

-----

The MS subsequently sends up to two SN Report MAC headers that include the next ARQ Block (or virtual MAC SDU) sequence number that it is expecting to receive from BS for each of its connections that have SN feedback enabled. The MS shall send the sequence numbers in numerical ascending order of the SFID values of the CIDs values.

-----

Same change should be done at page 190 line 46

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change:

-----

The MS subsequently sends up to two SN Report MAC headers that include the next ARQ Block (or virtual MAC SDU) sequence number that it is expecting to receive from BS for each of its connections that have SN feedback enabled. The MS shall send the sequence numbers in numerical ascending order of the SFID values of the CIDs values.

-----

Same change should be done at page 190 line 46

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

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This is a mess. Other changes have obliterated the quoted text; there's nothing for me to hang these changes on.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5292**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **194** Starting Line # **9**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.2**

DVJ85(subclause=6.3.22.2,page=194,line=9):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Selection

==>

selection

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Selection

==>

selection

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5293**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	196	18		6.3.22.8

DVJ86(subclause=6.3.22.8,page=196,line=18):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Termination

==&gt;

termination

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Termination

==&gt;

termination

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5294**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	196	Starting Line #	36	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.22.8.1
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

Last part of contribution 143r8 (comment 4129) was accepted but not implemented in 16eD8.

**Suggested Remedy**

[In D7, change section 6.3.22.8.1, as follows ]

## 6.3.22.8.1 MS side

An MS may terminate MS Idle Mode at any time.

An MS shall terminate Idle Mode and re-enter the network if it decodes a BS Broadcast Paging message that contains the MS own MS MAC Address hash and an Action Code of 10, enter network. In the event that an MS decodes a BS Broadcast Paging message that contains the MS own MS MAC Address hash and an Action Code of 01, Perform Ranging, the MS shall conduct and complete Idle Mode Location Update to establish location to the network and acknowledge message decoding. In both cases for the OFDMA PHY, if a PHY specific ranging code and transmission opportunity are assigned to the MS in the MOB\_PAG-ADV message, the MS shall perform Idle Mode Location Update by transmitting the code at the transmission opportunity assigned in the MOB\_PAG-ADV message on the dedicated ranging region assigned in the UL-MAP-IE (UIUC = 12 and dedicated ranging indicator bit set to '1').

The procedure for PHY specific ranging code and transmission opportunity operation is described as follows:

- After receiving the MOB\_PAG-ADV, the MS shall transmit the assigned ranging code at the transmission opportunity in the assigned ranging region in consecutive frames during the Page-Response window. The consecutive transmission can be terminated early if the MS receives a RNG-RSP before the end of the Page-Response window.
- In the case where RNG-RSP message with 'continue' status is received, then the BS may allocate in the ~~DL~~UL-MAP dedicated ranging region, in this case, the MS shall use the assigned ranging code and transmission opportunity provided in the MOB\_PAG-ADV message.

[In D7, change subclause 6.3.2.3.55 (MOB\_PAG-ADV message), page 119, as follows ]

## Action Code

Paging action instruction to MS to perform the following action:

00=No Action Required

01=Perform Ranging to establish location and acknowledge message

10=Enter Network

11=reserved

For OFDMA PHY, when a BS pages multiple MSs, the BS may assign dedicated CDMA codes to one or more MS being paged. The BS shall first list the MAC Address Hash of those MSs that are assigned dedicated CDMA codes, followed by the MSs that are not assigned dedicated CDMA codes.

For OFDMA PHY, one of the following TLV may be included in the MOB\_PAG-ADV management message:

CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment (11.18.1)

OFDMA-PHY specific parameter used to indicate CDMA code assignment and transmission opportunity assigned to one or more MSs being paged in this message. One CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment in the TLV corresponds to one MS paged. The order of the assignments is the same as the order of appearance of MS MAC address hash in this message.

[In D7, change subclause 11.18.1, as follows ]

#### 11.18.1 CDMA code and transmission opportunity assignment

This field indicates the assigned code and the transmission opportunity for a MS who is paged to use over dedicated CDMA ranging channelregion.

Type	Length	Notes	Scope
150	variable; <del>N_assign</del> <sup>8+</sup> N_assign x <u>816</u> bits	Bit #0 - #7: N-assign Subsequent (N_assign x <u>816</u> ) bits: for (i = 0, i < N_assign, i++) { 8 bits code index assigned to a MS who is paged. <u>8 bits transmission opportunity offset assigned to a MS who is paged</u> }	OFDMA

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5214.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5295**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **197** Starting Line # **4** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.8.1**

The draft claims that are special back-off values for ranging during re-entry from Idle mode. However, these are not defined. Nor do they seem to be necessary, as the BS has the ability to instruct the MS to do dedicated ranging (without backoff).

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove the following text:

~~"To prevent collisions from multiple MS trying to wake from Idle mode at the same time, the MS shall use special initial ranging back-off values that will be advertised in the UCD message."~~

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change the text as indicated:

"To prevent collisions from multiple MS trying to wake from Idle mode at the same time, the MS shall use special the initial-ranging back-off values Initial ranging backoff start and Initial ranging backoff end described in Table 349. ~~that will be advertised in the UCD message.~~"

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change the text as indicated:

"To prevent collisions from multiple MS trying to wake from Idle mode at the same time, the MS shall use special the initial-ranging back-off values Initial ranging backoff start and Initial ranging backoff end described in Table 349. ~~that will be advertised in the UCD message.~~"

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5296**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **197** Starting Line # **23** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.9.1**

DVJ87(subclause=6.3.22.9.1,page=197,line=23):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Conditions  
==>  
conditions

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Conditions  
==>  
conditions

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5297**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	197	Starting Line #	31	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.22.9.1.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

DVJ88(subclause=6.3.22.9.1.1,page=197,line=31):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Update

==>

update

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Update

==>

update

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5298**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **197** Starting Line # **41** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.9.1.2**

DVJ89(subclause=6.3.22.9.1.2,page=197,line=41):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Update  
==>  
update

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Update  
==>  
update

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5299**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	197	Starting Line #	47	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.22.9.1.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

DVJ90(subclause=6.3.22.9.1.2,page=197,line=47):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Update

==>

update

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Update

==>

update

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5300**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **198** Starting Line # **7**

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.9.1.4**

DVJ91(subclause=6.3.22.9.1.4,page=198,line=7):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Update

==>

update

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Update

==>

update

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5301**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 198 Starting Line # 15 Fig/Table# Section 6.3.22.9.2

DVJ92(subclause=6.3.22.9.2,page=198,line=15):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Process  
==>  
process

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Process  
==>  
process

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5302**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **198** Starting Line # **19** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.9.2**

DVJ93(subclause=6.3.22.9.2,page=198,line=19):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Process  
==>  
process

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Process  
==>  
process

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5303**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **198** Starting Line # **24** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.9.2.1**

DVJ94(subclause=6.3.22.9.2.1,page=198,line=24):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Process  
==>  
process

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Process  
==>  
process

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5304**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **198** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.9.2.1**  
Text is incorrect and inconsistent with the definition of the Location Update Request flag in the Ranging Purpose Indication TLV in §11.5 on page 510.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change phrase to read "...including Ranging Purpose Indication TLV with bit ~~#0~~#1 set to 1 ...".

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change phrase to read "...including Ranging Purpose Indication TLV with bit ~~#0~~#1 set to 1 ...".

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change phrase to read "...including Ranging Purpose Indication TLV with bit ~~#0~~#1 set to 1 ...".

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5305**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **198** Starting Line # **44** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.22.9.2.2**

DVJ95(subclause=6.3.22.9.2.2,page=198,line=44):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Process  
==>  
process

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Process  
==>  
process

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5306**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	199	Starting Line #	63	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.22.10
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

The text for ordering of New CIDs does not reflect a previously accepted contribution nor does it reflect the text incorporated into §6.3.2.3.52 on page 121.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change sentence to read "... that includes service flow remapping information in SFID, New\_CID, ~~Old\_CID~~ and Connection\_Info TLVs".

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change sentence to read "... that includes service flow remapping information in SFID, New\_CID, ~~Old\_CID~~ and Connection\_Info TLVs".

On page 518 line 43, change the text as indicated:

<del>Old_CID</del>	<u>SFID</u>	16.2	<u>24</u>	<u>Service flow ID</u>	<del>Old_CID before hand-over from old BSs.</del>
--------------------	-------------	------	-----------	------------------------	---

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change sentence to read "... that includes service flow remapping information in SFID, New\_CID, ~~Old\_CID~~ and Connection\_Info TLVs".

On page 518 line 43, change the text as indicated:

<del>Old_CID</del>	<u>SFID</u>	16.2	<u>24</u>	<u>Service flow ID</u>	<del>Old_CID before hand-over from old BSs.</del>
--------------------	-------------	------	-----------	------------------------	---

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5307**

Comment submitted by: Tal

Kaitz

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **200** Starting Line #Fig/Table# Section **6.3.23**

The current draft defines two mechanisms that can be used for rate adaptation:

- average CINR reports
- preferred-DIUC reports.

Both mechanisms are not well defined, and lack several important definitions.

**Suggested Remedy**

Discuss and adopt contribution 802.16e-05/269 ("CINR and Preferred-MCS Reports For OFDMA PHY").

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superseded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

[See comment 5030.](#)

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5308**

Comment submitted by: **Jaehee**

**Cho**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **200**

Starting Line # **16**

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.23**

For the proper operation of CINR report, we propose efficient scheme and needed text changes.

**Suggested Remedy**

[Discuss and adopt C80216e-05\\_299](#)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: [Superseded](#)**

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

[See comment 5030.](#)

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) [none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5309**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **201** Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table# Section **7**

EAP keying draft has reverted to previous terminology

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace all instances of "AAA-Key" in the spec with MSK

Add MSK - "Master Session Key" to acronym list

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

Recommendation by

Replace all instances of "AAA-Key" in the spec with MSK

Add MSK - "Master Session Key" to acronym list

(There are 15 instances from a search on D8 draft)

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Replace all instances of "AAA-Key" in the spec with MSK

Add MSK - "Master Session Key" to acronym list

(There are 15 instances from a search on D8 draft)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5310**

Comment submitted by: **Jeff**

**Mandin**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment      Type **Editorial**      Starting Page # **201**      Starting Line # **19**      Fig/Table#      Section **7**

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the "editorial instructions" text that begin at pg 201 line 19

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Delete the "editorial instructions" text that begin at pg 201 line 19

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5311**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **5** Fig/Table# Section **7.1**

DVJ102(subclause=7.1,page=204,line=5):  
Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

EAP Method Protocol

==>

EAP method protocol

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

EAP Method Protocol

==>

EAP method protocol

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

EAP Method Protocol

==>

EAP method protocol

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5312**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **11** Fig/Table# Section **7.1**

DVJ100(subclause=7.1,page=204,line=11):  
Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

Authorization / SA  
Control

==>

Authorization / SA  
control

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Authorization / SA  
Control

==>

Authorization / SA  
control

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Authorization / SA  
Control

==>

Authorization / SA  
control

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5313**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **11** Fig/Table# Section **7.1**

DVJ101(subclause=7.1,page=204,line=11):  
Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

Suggested Remedy

EAP Encapsulation / Decapsulation  
==>  
EAP encapsulation / decapsulation

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

EAP Encapsulation / Decapsulation  
==>  
EAP encapsulation / decapsulation

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5314**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **11** Fig/Table# Section **7.1**

DVJ103(subclause=7.1,page=204,line=11):  
Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

RSA - based Authentication  
==>  
RSA - based authentication

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

RSA - based Authentication  
==>  
RSA - based authentication

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5315**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **15** Fig/Table# Section **7.1**

DVJ99(subclause=7.1,page=204,line=15):  
Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

PKM Control Management  
==>  
PKM control management

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

PKM Control Management  
==>  
PKM control management

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

PKM Control Management  
==>  
PKM control management

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5316**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **19** Fig/Table# Section **7.1**

DVJ96(subclause=7.1,page=204,line=19):  
Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

Control Message Processing  
==>  
Control message processing

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Control Message Processing  
==>  
Control message processing

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Control Message Processing  
==>  
Control message processing

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5317**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **20** Fig/Table# Section **7.1**

DVJ98(subclause=7.1,page=204,line=20):  
Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

Traffic Data  
Encryption / Authentication  
Processing  
==>  
Traffic data  
encryption / authentication  
processing

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Traffic Data  
Encryption / Authentication  
Processing  
==>  
Traffic data  
encryption / authentication  
processing

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Traffic Data  
Encryption / Authentication  
Processing  
==>  
Traffic data  
encryption / authentication  
processing

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5318**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **22** Fig/Table# Section **7.1**

DVJ97(subclause=7.1,page=204,line=22):  
Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

Message Authentication Processing

==>

Message authentication processing

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Message Authentication Processing

==>

Message authentication processing

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted**

Message Authentication Processing

==>

Message authentication processing

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5319**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **204** Starting Line # **57** Fig/Table# Section **7.1.2**  
 Correction

## Suggested Remedy

Modify:

The

key management protocol uses either EAP [IETF RFC 3748], or X.509 digital certificates [IETF RFC 3280] together with RSA public-key encryption algorithm [PKCS #1], **or a sequence including both**, to perform authentication.

## Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

In page 204, line 57:

The key management protocol uses either EAP [IETF RFC 3748], or X.509 digital certificates [IETF RFC 3280] together with RSA public-key encryption algorithm [PKCS #1], **or a sequence starting with RSA authentication and followed by EAP to perform authentication.**

## Reason for Recommendation

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

In page 204, line 57:

The key management protocol uses either EAP [IETF RFC 3748], or X.509 digital certificates [IETF RFC 3280] together with RSA public-key encryption algorithm [PKCS #1], **or a sequence starting with RSA authentication and followed by EAP to perform authentication.**

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

## Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5320**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **205** Starting Line # **5** Fig/Table# Section **7.1.2**  
 Some corrections to 7.1.2/7.1.3 from IETF review

**Suggested Remedy**

1. Modify pg. 205 line 5:

Each MS presents its credentials, which will be a unique X.509 digital certificate issued by the MS's manufacturer (in the case of RSA authentication) or a ~~vendor-specific~~ **operator-specified** credential (in the case of EAP-based authentication).

2. Modify pg. 206 line 6

PKM EAP Authentication uses Extensible Authentication Protocol [IETF RFC 3748] in conjunction with a ~~vendor-operator-selected~~ **standardized** EAP Method

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

1. Modify pg. 205 line 5:

Each MS presents its credentials, which will be a unique X.509 digital certificate issued by the MS's manufacturer (in the case of RSA authentication) or a ~~vendor-specific~~ **operator-specified** credential (in the case of EAP-based authentication).

2. Modify pg. 206 line 6

PKM EAP Authentication uses Extensible Authentication Protocol [IETF RFC 3748] in conjunction with a ~~vendor-operator-selected~~ **standardized** EAP Method

3. In Table 343, change all instances of 'vendor specific' to 'operator specified'.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

1. Modify pg. 205 line 5:

Each MS presents its credentials, which will be a unique X.509 digital certificate issued by the MS's manufacturer (in the case of RSA authentication) or a ~~vendor-specific~~ **operator-specified** credential (in the case of EAP-based authentication).



2. Modify pg. 206 line 6

PKM EAP Authentication uses Extensible Authentication Protocol [IETF RFC 3748] in conjunction with a ~~vendor-operator~~-selected ~~standardized~~ EAP Method

3. In Table 343, change all instances of 'vendor specific' to 'operator specified'.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5321**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **206** Starting Line # **12** Fig/Table# Section **7.1.3.2**  
 (From IETF review:)

IEEE 802.16e D8 does not specify a mandatory-to-implement EAP method. Nor does it specify the required security properties of EAP methods to be used with it. The specification as it stands permits implementations to use EAP MD5-Challenge, which does not generate keys and is vulnerable to dictionary attacks.

We strongly recommend that at a minimum IEEE 802.16e should specify security requirements for the EAP methods to be used with it. RFC 4017 (developed by IEEE 802.11i) serves as an example of what this would entail.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace:

"The particular credentials and EAP methods that are to be used are outside of the scope of this specification, but they should be selected with awareness of the security issues described in [IETF RFC 3748] section 7."

with:

The particular credentials and EAP methods that are to be used are outside of the scope of this specification. However, the method selected **MUST** fulfill the "mandatory criteria" listed in section 2.2 of RFC 4017.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Replace:

"The particular credentials and EAP methods that are to be used are outside of the scope of this specification, but they should be selected with awareness of the security issues described in [IETF RFC 3748] section 7."

with:

"The particular credentials and EAP methods that are to be used are outside of the scope of this specification. However, the **EAP** method selected **SHOULD** fulfill the "mandatory criteria" listed in section 2.2 of RFC 4017. Use of an EAP method not meeting these criteria may lead to security vulnerabilities."

Also make an editorial change in figure 130j.  
 Replace "EAP method protocol" with "EAP method"

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Replace:

"The particular credentials and EAP methods that are to be used are outside of the scope of this specification, but they should be selected with awareness of the security issues described in [IETF RFC 3748] section 7."

with:

"The particular credentials and EAP methods that are to be used are outside of the scope of this specification. However, the **EAP** method selected **should** fulfill the "mandatory criteria" listed in section 2.2 of RFC 4017. Use of an EAP method not meeting these criteria may lead to security vulnerabilities."

Also make an editorial change in figure 130j.  
Replace "EAP method protocol" with "EAP method"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5322**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **206** Starting Line # **58**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.2.1.1**

**Wrong reference**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Change the reference from 6.4.9 to 6.3.9.**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

**Change the reference from 6.4.9 to 6.3.9.**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5323**Comment submitted by: **David V.****James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **207** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.1.3.1**  
DVJ104(subclause=7.2.1.3.1,page=207,line=32):  
IEEE Style prohibits two lettered lists in one subclause.

**Suggested Remedy**

Use dashed list or fix another way.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Use dashed list or fix another way.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5324**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **208** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.1.4.1**  
 TEK State machine vs. PN (Packet Number) clarification.

**Suggested Remedy**

Contribution C80216e-05\_284.doc

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by***Make the following changes**In 7.2.2.1 Security associations**Delete the following sentence in page, 209, lines 35-41*

~~For AES-GCM mode, when more than half the available PN numbers in the 31-bit PN number space are exhausted, the MS shall schedule a future Key Request in the same fashion as if the key lifetime was approaching expiry. The operation of the TEK state machine's Key Request scheduling algorithm, combined with the BS's regimen for updating and using an SAID's keying material (see 7.4), ensures that the MS will be able to continually exchange encrypted traffic with the BS.~~

*In 7.2.1.4.1 TEK exchange overview for PMP**Add the following:*

BS TEK management:

BS switches the TEK if:

- " New\_Key lifetime reaches half-way.
- " Old\_Key\_DL\_PN = DL\_MAX\_TH (this is the key the BS used for DL thus no other DL PN may grow).
- " New\_Key\_UL\_PN=UL\_MIN\_TH.

Switch keys is:

- " Discard "old" key and its context.
- " Mark current "new" key as "old" key: "old key" $\pi$ "new key"
- " Mark fresh key as the "new" key: "new key" $\pi$ "fresh key"

SS TEK management

SS ask for key update if:

- " New Key Grace time reached
- " New\_Key\_DL\_PN=DL\_MIN\_TH
- " New\_Key\_UL\_PN=UL\_MAX\_TH

This algorithm should ensure that no key PN will reach it's maximum value (the entire space) however, if one key reaches this value this key should

This algorithm should ensure that no key PN will reach its maximum value (the entire space) however, if one key reaches this value this key should be discarded and not used anymore.

*In Section 10.2 PKM parameter values*

*Add to table 343 the following rows ( table also clearly shown in contribution C80216e-05\_284)*

System	Name	Description	Min value	Default value	Max value
SS	DL min TH	Value of DL PN in new key that trigger the SS to ask for key update			0x3FFFFFFF
SS	UL max TH	Value of UL PN in new key that trigger the SS to ask for key update			0xDFFFFFFF
BS	DL max TH	Value of DL PN in old key that trigger the BS to switch keys			0x5FFFFFFF
BS	UL min TH	Value of UL PN in new key that trigger the BS to switch keys			0xBFFFFFFF

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

The current mechanisms in 802.16d are sufficient for this.

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions     none needed

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5325**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**  
authorization state machine clarification

Starting Page # **208**

Starting Line # **36**

Fig/Table#

Section

**7.2.1.6**

**Suggested Remedy**

*Contribution C80216e-05\_300.doc*

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Adopt the contribution *C80216e-05\_300.doc*

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Adopt the contribution *C80216e-05\_300.doc*

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

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5326**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **208** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2.1**

When any data encryption is not supported, an MS shall not start TEK state machines. However, the current text says as if every MS shall start TEK state machines upon achieving authorization. It is because of the lack of consideration of the "No data encryption" case.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the following change:

Upon achieving authorization, an MS starts a separate TEK state machine for each of the SAIDs identified in the Authorization Reply or SA-TEK-RSP message: unless the data encryption algorithm identifier of the SA is set to 0.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

*1. Modify page 208, line 53 as follows:*

Upon achieving authorization, an MS starts a separate TEK state machine for each of the SAIDs identified in the Authorization Reply or PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response message, if data traffic encryption is provisioned for one or more service flows.

*2. Also check and replace all instances of SA-TEK-Request and SA-TEK-Response and SA-TEK-Challenge with the prefix PKMv2 added.*

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*1. Modify page 208, line 53 as follows:*

Upon achieving authorization, an MS starts a separate TEK state machine for each of the SAIDs identified in the Authorization Reply or PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response message, if data traffic encryption is provisioned for one or more service flows.

*2. Also check and replace all instances of SA-TEK-Request and SA-TEK-Response and SA-TEK-Challenge with the prefix PKMv2 added.*

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

That's yet another big honkin' global search-and-replace. Have a look to see if things are okay.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5327**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **209** Starting Line # **50** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2.2**

DVJ105(subclause=7.2.2.2,page=209,line=50):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Derivation

==>

derivation

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Derivation

==>

derivation

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5328**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Non-binding	209	57		

The EC bit in the GMH allows sending un encrypted packets on security enabled connection- this is a vulnerability

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the folowing to the end of section 7.2.2.1 security associations

Messages send on CIDs belonged to an SA which has security suite for data protection must be encrypted.

If a message received with EC bit not set but the SA used with this message contains data security suite, it shall be discarded.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

*Add the folowing to the end of section 7.2.2.1 security associations*

MAC PDUs sent on connections that belong to an SA that includes data encryption, shall be encrypted. A MAC PDU received on such connections, with the EC bit not set, shall be discarded.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

*Add the folowing to the end of section 7.2.2.1 security associations*

MAC PDUs sent on connections that belong to an SA that includes data encryption, shall be encrypted. A MAC PDU received on such connections, with the EC bit not set, shall be discarded.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5329**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	210	Starting Line #	47	Fig/Table#	Section	7.2.2.2.2
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

From IETF review:

IEEE 802.16e D8 Section 7.2.2.2.2 states:

"Note that this EAP authentication method shall not derive key material and PMK"

.....

not requiring the BS to demonstrate possession of PMKs from all EAP authentications enables the man-in-the-middle attack, described in [BINDING]. We strongly suggest that IEEE 802.16e address this vulnerability prior to publication.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remedy the man-in-the-middle attack on "EAP after EAP mode" that is described in this comment.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by***In section 7.2.2.2.2**Change*

"The PMK and EIK derivation from the AAA-key is as follows:

EIK | PMK = truncate (AAA-key, 288)

If more keying material is needed for future link ciphers, the key length of the PMK may be increased.

After successful EAP based authorization, if the MS or BS wants to run additional EAP authentication (Note that this EAP authentication method shall not derive key materials and PMK), the authenticated EAP messages shall carry EAP message. It shall cryptographically bind previous RSA EAP authentication and following EAP authentication session, while protecting second EAP messages."

*to*

"The PMK derivation from the MSK is as follows:

PMK = truncate (MSK, 160)

If more keying material is needed for future link ciphers, the key length of the PMK may be increased."

*Also in 11.8.4.2 Authorization policy support*

Also in 7.2.2.2 Authorization policy support

Change the following row

0 | 1 | 1 | EAP-based authorization and Authenticated EAP-based authorization

to

0 | 1 | 1 | N/A

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

In section 7.2.2.2.2

Change:

"The PMK and EIK derivation from the AAA-key is as follows:

EIK | PMK = truncate (AAA-key, 288)

If more keying material is needed for future link ciphers, the key length of the PMK may be increased.

After successful EAP based authorization, if the MS or BS wants to run additional EAP authentication (Note that this EAP authentication method shall not derive key materials and PMK), the authenticated EAP messages shall carry EAP message. It shall cryptographically bind previous RSA EAP authentication and following EAP authentication session, while protecting second EAP messages."

to:

"The PMK derivation from the MSK is as follows:

PMK = truncate (MSK, 160)

If more keying material is needed for future link ciphers, the key length of the PMK may be increased."

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

This removes the Man-in-the middle vulnerability associated with the EAP after EAP mode raised by IETF.

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5330**

Comment submitted by: Seokheon

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **210** Starting Line # **52** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2.2.3**

Since the PMK and the PAK are root keys to derive the AK, both of them are used to derive the AK as not input data but input keys.

## Suggested Remedy

Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/281

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

*First Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/281r3*

*Then in Section 7.8.2, p 233, lines 18-21 make the following changes*

After successful RSA based authorization either EAP based authorization or Authenticated EAP based authorization maybe supported according to the value of Authorization policy negotiated in the SBC-REQ/RSP messages. It shall cryptographically bind RSA and further EAP authentication.

## Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

*[First Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/281r3*

*Then in Section 7.8.2, p 233, lines 18-21 make the following changes*

After successful RSA based authorization either EAP based authorization or Authenticated EAP based authorization maybe supported according to the value of Authorization policy negotiated in the SBC-REQ/RSP messages. It shall cryptographically bind RSA and further EAP authentication.

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

## Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

In contribution 281r3, a sentence was change to read "The GTEK is randomly generated at the BS or at certain network node", I'm not sure that "network node" is well defined..

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5331**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	210	Starting Line #	61	Fig/Table#	Section	7.2.2.2.3
---------	------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

The derivation of AK is incorrect when both PAK and PMK are known. In particular, PAK is part of the input key (XOR'd with PMK) and not part of the key label.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change this key derivation to read:

AK <= Dot16KDF (PMK xor PAK, SSID | BSID | ~~PAK~~ | "AK", 160)**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5330

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment #5330

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5332**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	211	Starting Line #	3	Fig/Table#	Section	7.2.2.2.3
---------	------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-----------

The derivation of AK is incorrect when only PAK is known. In particular, PAK is the input key and not part of the key label.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change this key derivation to read:

AK <= Dot16KDF ( $\theta$ -PAK, SSID | BSID | PAK | "AK", 160)

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5330

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Superceded**

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

See comment #5330

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5333**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
		212	53	131	7.2.2.2.10

This figure is incomplete -- it is missing a box showing derivation of the AK from the (EIK and) PAK inputs.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add a box taking the (EIK and) PAK inputs and containing the (corrected) pseudo-function reference from page 211, line 3:  
[Dot16KDF \(PAK, SSID | BSID | "AK", 160\)](#)

The box should also show the AK as the output.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

[See comment #5330](#)**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superceded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment #5330](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5334**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Starting Page # **213** Starting Line # **26** Fig/Table# **132** Section **7.2.2.2.10**

This figure is incorrect. Inside the AK derivation box should be the (corrected) pseudo-function reference from page 210, line 61.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text inside AK derivation box to read:  
Dot16KDF (PMK xor PAK, SSID | BSID | "AK", 160)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5330

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment #5330

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5335**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**  
PAK is missing in the formula for AK generation.

Starting Page # **213** Starting Line # **26**

Fig/Table# **132** Section **7.2.2.2.10**

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the following change:  
Dot16KDF (PMK, SSID|BSID|**PAK**"AK", 160)

Proposed Resolution  
See comment #5330

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

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

See comment #5330

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5336**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ106(subclause=7.2.2.2.10,page=214,line=32): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	214	32		7.2.2.2.10

**Suggested Remedy**

From external source

==&gt;

from external source

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

From external source

==&gt;

from external source

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5337**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	214	Starting Line #	52	Fig/Table#	Section	7.2.2.3.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ107(subclause=7.2.2.3.1,page=214,line=52):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Associations

==&gt;

associations

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Associations

==&gt;

associations

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5338**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **215**

Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.2.2.3.1**

Security Association scope clarification

**Suggested Remedy**

Add to the end of section 7.2.2.3.1

A security association is uniquely shared between a BS and an SS.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

See comment 5698

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

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

See comment 5698

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5339**

Comment submitted by: Lei

Wang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **215** Starting Line # **35** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2.3.3**  
 The concept of "Authorized Association" is not defined in the standard.

**Suggested Remedy**  
 defined it.

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by  
*In section 7.2.2.3.3, page 215, lines 34-37:*

Replace

The primary keying material in the MBS Group Security Association is the MAK. This serves the same function as the AK in the Authorized Association, however the MAK is provisioned by an external entity, such as an MBS server. The MAK may be common among members of an MBS group.

with

The primary keying material in the MBS Group Security Association is the MAK. ~~This serves the same function as the AK in the Authorized Association, however~~ The MAK is provisioned by an external entity, such as an MBS server. The MAK may be common among members of an MBS group.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

*In section 7.2.2.3.3, page 215, lines 34-37:*

Replace

The primary keying material in the MBS Group Security Association is the MAK. This serves the same function as the AK in the Authorized Association, however the MAK is provisioned by an external entity, such as an MBS server. The MAK may be common among members of an MBS group.

with

The primary keying material in the MBS Group Security Association is the MAK. ~~This serves the same function as the AK in the Authorized Association, however~~ The MAK is provisioned by an external entity, such as an MBS server. The MAK may be common among members of an MBS group.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5340**                      Comment submitted by: Panyuh                      Joo                      Member                      2005/06/08

Comment                      Type **Editorial**                      Starting Page # **215**                      Starting Line # **45**                      Fig/Table#                      Section **7.2.2.3.3**

The generation and usage of MGTEK is not clearly described in the MBS Group Security Association.

Suggested Remedy

Add the following sentence to the MGTEK description:

The MGTEK is a random number provisioned by the access network such as a BS as an access network authorization key. It is only used for generating MTK together with MAK.

Proposed Resolution                      Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5352

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment #5352

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5341**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	215	Starting Line #	51	Fig/Table#	Section	7.2.2.4
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------

From IETF review:

It appears that there are circumstances where a BS could hold two PMKs for a given MS (such as during EAP re-authentication). As part of the PMK cache definition, 802.16e should explicitly describe when PMKs are installed and deleted. For example, does installation of a new PMK automatically destroy the old PMK? It appears that this is implied by IEEE 802.16e D8, but it is not explicitly stated.

.....

Does failure of EAP authentication result in automatic deletion of the PMK? 802.16e is not explicit about this; we would suggest that it is best not to delete the PMK in this case to prevent DoS attacks.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt contribution "Clarifications on key caching, activation, deletion" ( C80216e-05\_292 )

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by***[Add the following new section 7.2.2.2.11 : ]*

## 7.2.2.2.11 Maintenance of PMK and AK

The BS and MS maintain cached PMK and AK as follows:

## a) PMK caching

An MS caches a PMK upon successful EAP authentication. An Authenticator caches a PMK upon its receipt via the AAA protocol. Upon caching a new PMK for a particular MS, an Authenticator shall delete any PMK for that MS (as well as all associated AKs).

For the case of reauthentication, deletion of old PMKs at Authenticator and MS is accomplished via the switchover mechanism defined in section xxx (*Editor Note: see section from contribution 300*).

The Authenticator and MS will additionally delete PMKs and/or associated AKs in various situations - including lifetime expiration, reauthentication, and reclamation of memory resources, or as the result of other mechanisms beyond the scope of this specification..

In the case of re-authentication, the older PMK and its AKs shall be deleted by the MS after verifying the HMAC or CMAC of the PKMv2 SA-TEK challenge message and the BS after verifying the HMAC/CMAC of the PKMv2 SA-TEK request message.

## b) AK activation and deactivation

Successful completion of the 3 way SA TEK handshake causes the activation of all the AKs associated with the new PMK (i.e. all AKs on BSec

Successful completion of the 3-way SA-TEK handshake causes the activation of all the AKs associated with the new PMK (ie. all AKs on BSSs associated with the current authenticator will be active).

If the packet counter belonging to a short HMAC or a CMAC key reaches its maximum value, the associated AK becomes permanently deactivated.

The BS and MS must maintain the AK context (ie. replay counters etc.) as long as they retain the AK.

[Change text beginning at page 230, line 58 as follows: ]

The SA-TEK 3-way handshake sequence proceeds as follows:

1. During initial network entry or reauthorization, the BS shall send SA-TEK-Challenge (including a random number RandomBS) to the MS after protecting it with the CMAC/HMAC tuple (using the AK derived from the new PMK). If the BS does not receive SA-TEK-Request from the MS within SACHallengeTimer, it shall resend the previous PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge.

The BS may send SA-TEK-Challenge up to SACHallengeMaxResends times. If the BS reaches its maximum number of resends, it shall discard the AK and may initiate full re-authentication or drop the MS.

2. If HO Process Optimization bit #1 is set indicating that PKM Authentication phase is omitted during network re-entry or handover, the BS begins the 3-way-handshake by appending the SA Challenge Tuple TLV to the RNG-RSP. If the BS does not receive PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request from the MS within SaChallenge-Timer (suggested to be several times greater than the length of SaChallengeTimer), it shall discard the AK and may initiate full re-authentication or drop the MS. If the BS receives an initial RNG-REQ during the period that PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request is expected, it shall send a new RNG-RSP with another SaChallenge TLV.

3. The MS shall send PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request to the BS after protecting it with the CMAC/HMAC. If the MS does not receive PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response from the BS within SATEKTimer, it shall resend the request. The MS may resend the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request up to SATEKRequestMaxResends times. If the MS reaches its maximum number of resends, it shall discard the AK and may initiate full re-authentication or decide to connect to another BS or take some other action.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5342**Comment submitted by: **Lei****Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **215** Starting Line # **53**Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2.4**

In this Security Context section, there is no sub-section for MGTEK context. Why is it?

If MGTEK is considered as a sub-type of GTEK, then it should be specified.

## Suggested Remedy

If MGTEK is considered as a sub-type of GTEK, then in line 55 on page 217, insert the following:

MGTEK is a sub-type of GTEK.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

[See comment #5352](#)

## Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment #5352](#)

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **) none needed**

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5343**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **216** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2.4.1**

According to EAP review, PMK has to be in a context and the scope of this context must be well defined.  
This is missing in the standard

**Suggested Remedy**

Accept contribution C80216e-05\_301.doc

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Accept contribution C80216e-05\_301r1.doc

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

This contribution has to consider PAK context and any identifier to associate PMK context with AK context or PAK context with AK context.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5344**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **216** Starting Line # **3**Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2.4.1**

Table 133 is missing the headers from the part that continues onto the next page.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the headers appear on the second part of the table and add "(continued)" to the title on the second page (there is an auto-magic field in Framemaker for this.) Fix this here and all other locations in the draft. Almost all of the tables now have a consistent format, nevertheless, check all of the tables to make sure that the formatting is consistent throughout the draft.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Format Table 133 appropriately

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Format Table 133 appropriately

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This is not a technical comment; this is editorial. The tight schedule for this re-circ does not permit me the luxury of tweaking cosmetic changes to tables. The IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual section 5.4.3.2 (Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes) reads: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5345**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **216**

Starting Line # **16**

Fig/Table#

Section

**7.2.2.4.1**

What 's TBS? No defintion in the current spec.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "TBS" to "Target BS".

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

In page 216, line 16, Change "TBS" to "Target BS".

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

In page 216, line 16, Change "TBS" to "Target BS".

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5346**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **216** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2.4.1**)  
DVJ108(subclause=7.2.2.4.1,page=216,line=28):  
Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Size (bits)

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Accepted****

Center the column under header: Size (bits)

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5347**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **217** Starting Line # **8**Fig/Table# **133** Section **7.2.2.4.1**

PMK/AK lifetime correction

**Suggested Remedy***[Change text of PMK lifetime field from table 133 page 217 line 8]*PMK lifetime, when the EAP-based authorization is achieved and the AAA-key is obtained. The value of PMK lifetime may be ~~transferred~~~~from the EAP-method~~ extract from the SA-TEK Challenge message following the EAP-based re/authorization or may be set by a vendor*[Add the followig entry to Table 37g section 6.3.2.3.9.17 SA-TEK-Challenge message]*Attribute : **PMK life time**Contents : **PMK life time**, this attribute shall include only follows EAP-based authorization or EAP-based re-authorization procedures.**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

*[Add the following entry to Table 37g section 6.3.2.3.9.17 SA-TEK-Challenge message]*Attribute : **Key lifetime**Contents : **PMK lifetime**, this attribute shall include only follows EAP-based authorization or EAP-based re-authorization procedures.**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified***[Add the following entry to Table 37g section 6.3.2.3.9.17 SA-TEK-Challenge message]*Attribute : **Key lifetime**Contents : **PMK lifetime**, this attribute shall include only follows EAP-based authorization or EAP-based re-authorization procedures.**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Part of the original remedy is addressed in comment #5343

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**



Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5348**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment            Type **Technical, Non-binding**            Starting Page # **217**            Starting Line # **28**            Fig/Table#            Section **7.2.2.4.1**

For AKID calculation, there is no clear explanation of usage of the 4-bit AK\_SN input to the Dot16KDF function. All the other inputs to the function are byte-aligned except the AK\_SN. So it would be clear to extend the AK\_SN to a 1-byte value with a most-significant-bit first order.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following sentence to the end of the AKID usage description.

The AK\_SN in the Dot16KDF function is an 8-bit number which consists of leading 4 zero bits and appending 4-bit AK\_SN in MSB first order.

**Proposed Resolution            Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Add the following sentence to the end of the AKID usage description.

The AK\_SN in the Dot16KDF function is an 8-bit number which consists of leading 4 zero bits and appending 4-bit AK\_SN in MSB first order.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Add the following sentence to the end of the AKID usage description.

The AK\_SN in the Dot16KDF function is an 8-bit number which consists of leading 4 zero bits and appending 4-bit AK\_SN in MSB first order.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5349**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **217**

Starting Line # **31**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.2.2.4.1**

An editorial mistake for describing the generation of AK Sequence Number

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the sentence as follows

This value is the least significant 2-bit of PAK sequence number concatenated with the least-most significant 2-bit of PMK sequence number.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change the sentence as follows

This value is the least significant 2-bit of PAK sequence number concatenated with the least-most significant 2-bit of PMK sequence number.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change the sentence as follows

This value is the least significant 2-bit of PAK sequence number concatenated with the least-most significant 2-bit of PMK sequence number.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5350**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **217** Starting Line # **41** Fig/Table# **133** Section **7.2.2.4.1**

An accepted change made in comment #4173 (C802.16e-05/227r3) is not fully incorporated into the D8 document because the last four rows of the table 133 is mistakenly deleted.

- Suggested Remedy

#### Suggested Remedy

Restore the last four rows of the Table 133 in D7 document and apply the following change to the last row:

KEK | 160 bits | Used to encrypt transport keys ~~TEK or GKEK~~ from the BS to the SS

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

Restore the last four rows of the Table 133 in D7 document and apply the following change to the last row:

KEK | 160 bits | Used to encrypt transport keys ~~TEK or GKEK~~ **GTEK** from the BS to the SS

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Restore the last four rows of the Table 133 in D7 document and apply the following change to the last row:

KEK | 160 bits | Used to encrypt transport keys ~~TEK or GKEK~~ **GTEK** from the BS to the SS

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5351**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **217**

Starting Line # **52**

Fig/Table#

Section

**7.2.2.4.2**

missing table number

**Suggested Remedy**

replace "table:" by "Table 134."

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

replace "table:" by "Table 134."

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

replace "table:" by "Table 134."

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5352**Comment submitted by: **Seokheon****Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Technical, Non-binding</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>7.9</b>

The MBRA is necessary to efficiently update key for the cell-based multicast service, the broadcast service, and even the MBS.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the contribution [C802.16e-05/277](#).

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt the contribution [C802.16e-05/277r1](#)

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Adopt the contribution [C802.16e-05/277r1](#)

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5353**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **218** Starting Line # **44** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.5**  
Clarification for the usage of TEKs on the transmitter

**Suggested Remedy***Change the following in section 7.2.5 :*

... For the unicast service, the BS includes in its Key Replies both of these TEKs, along with their remaining lifetimes. The BS encrypts downlink traffic with the older of its two TEKs and decrypts uplink traffic with either the older or newer TEK, depending upon which of the two keys the SS was using at the time. The SS encrypts uplink traffic with the newer of its two TEKs and decrypts downlink traffic with either the older or newer TEK, depending upon which of the two keys the BS was using at the time.

**Once a PDU is transmitted with a newer TEK the old TEK shall be withdrawn and shall not be used for future PDU transmissions.**

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*Change the following in section 7.2.5 :*

... For the unicast service, the BS includes in its Key Replies both of these TEKs, along with their remaining lifetimes. The BS encrypts downlink traffic with the older of its two TEKs and decrypts uplink traffic with either the older or newer TEK, depending upon which of the two keys the SS was using at the time. The SS encrypts uplink traffic with the newer of its two TEKs and decrypts downlink traffic with either the older or newer TEK, depending upon which of the two keys the BS was using at the time.

**Once a PDU is transmitted with a newer TEK the old TEK shall be withdrawn and shall not be used for future PDU transmissions.**

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

MS and BS know the exact key sequence number by EKS filed in GMH.  
The solution is wrong. The old TEK is needed for description so it cannot be deleted when using the new TEK for transmission.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    [l\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5354**

Comment submitted by: [Haixiang](#)

[He](#)

Member

2005/06/08

Comment            Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **218**

Starting Line # **44**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.2.5**

TEK usage clarification

**Suggested Remedy**

*Change the following in section 7.2.5 :*

... For the unicast service, the BS includes in its Key Replies both of these TEKs, along with their remaining lifetimes. The BS encrypts downlink traffic with the older of its two TEKs and decrypts uplink traffic with either the older or newer TEK, depending upon which of the two keys the SS was using at the time. The SS encrypts uplink traffic with the newer of its two TEKs and decrypts downlink traffic with either the older or newer TEK, depending upon which of the two keys the BS was using at the time.

**Once an MS or BS receives a PDU with a new TEK, it should delete the old TEK and/or uses the new TEK for future PDU transmissions.**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

[See comment 5353](#)

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5353](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    [l\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5355**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
OMAC usage when basic CID is absent.	Technical, Non-binding	227	12		

**Suggested Remedy**

Change section 7.5.4.1 as followed:

If the digest is included in an MPDU that has no CID, e.g. A RNG-REQ message, the CID used shall take the value of the basic CID. **If basic CID is unknown (e.g. in network reentry situation) then CID 0 should be used.**

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

Change section 7.5.4.1 as followed:

If the digest is included in an MPDU that has no CID, e.g. A RNG-REQ message, the CID used shall take the value of the basic CID. **If basic CID is unknown (e.g. in network reentry situation) then CID 0 should be used.**

and make the similar change on line 55, page 228.

change it to:

"For MAC messages that have no CID e.g. RNG-REQ message, the OMAC\_PN\_\* context will be the same as used on the basic CID. **If basic CID is unknown (e.g. in network reentry situation) then CID 0 should be used.**"

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Change section 7.5.4.1 as followed:

If the digest is included in an MPDU that has no CID, e.g. A RNG-REQ message, the CID used shall take the value of the basic CID. **If basic CID is unknown (e.g. in network reentry situation) then CID 0 should be used.**

and make the similar change on line 55, page 228.

change it to:

"For MAC messages that have no CID e.g. RNG-REQ message, the OMAC\_PN\_\* context will be the same as used on the basic CID. **If basic CID is unknown (e.g. in network reentry situation) then CID 0 should be used.**"

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**



Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5356**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **227**

Starting Line # **20**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.5.5.4**

**Numbering sequence is wrong**

Suggested Remedy

**7.5.5.1 AES KEKs**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

**7.5.5.1 AES KEKs**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**7.5.5.1 AES KEKs**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5357**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **227**

Starting Line # **30**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.5.5.5**

Numbering sequence is wrong

**Suggested Remedy**

7.5.5.2 Encryption of GKEK

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

7.5.5.2 Encryption of GKEK

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

7.5.5.2 Encryption of GKEK

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5358**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **227** Starting Line # **39**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.5.5.5.1**

Numbering sequence is wrong

**Suggested Remedy**

7.5.5.2.1 Encryption of GKEK with 3-DES

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

7.5.5.2.1 Encryption of GKEK with 3-DES

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

7.5.5.2.1 Encryption of GKEK with 3-DES

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5359**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **228**

Starting Line # **3**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.5.5.5.2**

Numbering sequence is wrong

**Suggested Remedy**

7.5.5.2.2 Encryption of GKEK with RSA

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

7.5.5.2.2 Encryption of GKEK with RSA

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

7.5.5.2.2 Encryption of GKEK with RSA

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5360**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **228**

Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.5.5.5.3**

Numbering sequence is wrong

**Suggested Remedy**

7.5.5.2.3 Encryption of GKEK with ECB mode AES

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

7.5.5.2.3 Encryption of GKEK with ECB mode AES

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

7.5.5.2.3 Encryption of GKEK with ECB mode AES

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5361**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **228**

Starting Line # **37**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.5.5.4**

Numbering sequence is wrong

**Suggested Remedy**

7.5.5.2.4 Encryption of GKEK with AES Key Wrap

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

7.5.5.2.4 Encryption of GKEK with AES Key Wrap

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

7.5.5.2.4 Encryption of GKEK with AES Key Wrap

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5362**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	229	4

Fig/Table#	Section
	7.5.7

DVJ109(subclause=7.5.7,page=229,line=4):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Derivation Functions

==&gt;

derivation functions

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Derivation Functions

==&gt;

derivation functions

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5363**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **229** Starting Line # **12** Fig/Table# Section **7.5.7.1**

The type of MAC (message authentication code) is indicated not by Authentication policy support (11.8.4.2) but by MAC mode (11.8.4.3).

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the following change:

In the case that the HMAC/CMAC setting in the ~~authentication policy bits~~ MAC (Message Authentication Code) mode is set to CMAC, the algorithm defined as:

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Make the following change:

In the case that the HMAC/CMAC setting in the ~~authentication policy bits~~ MAC (Message Authentication Code) mode is set to CMAC, the algorithm defined as:

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Make the following change:

In the case that the HMAC/CMAC setting in the ~~authentication policy bits~~ MAC (Message Authentication Code) mode is set to CMAC, the algorithm defined as:

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5364**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ110(subclause=7.8.1,page=231,line=10): Lists numbered wrong.**

Starting Page # **231** Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table# Section **7.8.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Use a,b,c lists**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

**Use a,b,c lists**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** c) instructions unclear

**I have no idea where the problem is or how to fix it. Please clarify.**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5365**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	231	Starting Line #	23	Fig/Table#	Section	7.8.1
---------	------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------

The AKID in the SA-TEK-Request is redundant because the MS must use the AK referenced by the AKID sent by the BS in the previous SA-TEK-Challenge message (or TLV). This text needs to be updated to reflect a previous comment that recommended deleting the AKID from the SA-TEK-Request.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text to read - "4. Upon receipt of SA-TEK-Request, a BS shall confirm that the supplied AKID refers to an AK that it has available. If the AKID is unrecognized, the BS shall ignore the message. The BS shall verify the CMAC/HMAC.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Comment removing AKID in #5136 is already rejected , hence this change does not make sense.

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Comment removing AKID in #5136 is already rejected , hence this change does not make sense.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5366**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type

Starting Page # **232** Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.8.1**

The current text used to describe the process for validating an SA-TEK-Response message is incomplete. In particular, validation of the nonces is not performed.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text to read - "Upon receipt of SA-TEK-Response, an MS shall verify the CMAC/HMAC. If the CMAC/HMAC is invalid, the MS shall ignore the message. The MS shall verify that the NonceSS value in the SA-TEK-Response matches the value provided by the MS in the SA-TEK-Request message. If the NonceSS value does not match, the MS shall ignore the message. The MS shall also verify that the BS Random value in the SA-TEK-Response matches the value provided by the BS in the SA-TEK-Challenge message or TLV. If the BS Random value does not match, the MS shall ignore the message".

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

Change text to read - "Upon receipt of PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response, an MS shall verify the CMAC/HMAC. If the CMAC/HMAC is invalid, the MS shall ignore the message. The MS shall verify that the SS Random value in the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response matches the value provided by the MS in the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request message. If the SS Random value does not match, the MS shall ignore the message. The MS shall also verify that the BS Random value in the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response matches the value provided by the BS in the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge message or TLV. If the BS Random value does not match, the MS shall ignore the message".

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Change text to read - "Upon receipt of PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response, an MS shall verify the CMAC/HMAC. If the CMAC/HMAC is invalid, the MS shall ignore the message. The MS shall verify that the SS Random value in the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response matches the value provided by the MS in the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Request message. If the SS Random value does not match, the MS shall ignore the message. The MS shall also verify that the BS Random value in the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Response matches the value provided by the BS in the PKMv2 SA-TEK-Challenge message or TLV. If the BS Random value does not match, the MS shall ignore the message".

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This text has already been modified. Please re-examine your proposed changes in light of the current document.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5367**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	232	Starting Line #	21	Fig/Table#	Section	7.8.2
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------

An accepted change made in comment #4197 is not fully incorporated into the D8 document.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the following change:

c) The BS providing the authenticated MS with an AK, from which a key encryption key (KEK), EAP Integrity Key (EIK), and message authentication keys are derived.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Make the following change:

c) The BS providing the authenticated MS with an AK, from which a key encryption key (KEK), EAP Integrity Key (EIK), and message authentication keys are derived.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

EIK is generated from Pre-PAK and PAK as shown in section 7.2.2.1

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5368**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **232** Starting Line # **60**

Fig/Table# Section **7.8.2**

PAK sequence number is 4 bits long.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make the following change:

- c) A 64-bit PAK sequence number, used to distinguish between successive generations of AKs.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Make the following change:

- c) A 64-bit PAK sequence number, used to distinguish between successive generations of AKs.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5369**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **233** Starting Line # **7**

Fig/Table# Section **7.8.2**

it seems ambiguity about the "two PKMv2 authorization messages". Which two?

**Suggested Remedy**

replace "reality of two PKMv2 authorization messages." by "the authenticity of the above two PKMv2 authorization messages."

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**

**Recommendation by**

Replace "reality of two PKMv2 authorization messages." with "the authenticity of the above PKMv2 RSA-Reply messages."

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Replace "reality of two PKMv2 authorization messages." with "the authenticity of the above PKMv2 RSA-Reply messages."

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5370**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **233** Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table# Section **7.8.2**

typo

Suggested Remedy

change "MSMS" to "MS"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

change "MSMS" to "MS"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5371**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **233** Starting Line # **35**

Fig/Table# Section **7.8.3.1**

typo?

Suggested Remedy

change "bind" to "bound"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

change "bind" to "bound"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5372**Comment submitted by: **Lei****Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **234** Starting Line # **3** Fig/Table# Section **7.8.3.2.2**

This section is about MGTEK establishment, however, none of the refered two other sections talk about the MGTEK establishment.

**Suggested Remedy**

add the description of "MGTEK establishment".

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by

See comment #5352

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superceded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment #5352

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5373**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **235** Starting Line # **6**

Fig/Table# Section **7.8.4.1.1**

DVJ111(subclause=7.8.4.1.1,page=235,line=6):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Header  
==>  
header

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Header  
==>  
header

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5374**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ112(subclause=7.8.4.1.1,page=235,line=6): Wrong**

Starting Page # **235** Starting Line # **6**

Fig/Table# Section **7.8.4.1.1**

Suggested Remedy  
**Sstream->stream**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**Sstream->stream**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5375**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ113(subclause=7.8.4.1.1,page=235,line=13): Wrong**

Starting Page # **235** Starting Line # **13**

Fig/Table# Section **7.8.4.1.1**

Suggested Remedy

**Ttraffic->traffic**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**Ttraffic->traffic**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5376**Comment submitted by: **Lei****Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **236** Starting Line # **18** Fig/Table# Section **7.8.4.2.1**  
For MBS, should MTK or MGTEK be used in the CBC IV generation?

**Suggested Remedy**

if MGTEK should be used, then in line 53 on page 235, change "included in the TEK keying information," to "included in the TEK keying information or MGTEK keying information for MBS, "

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

[See comment #5352](#)**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment #5352](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [1\) none needed](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5377**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>26</b>		<b>7.8.4.2.1</b>

DVJ114(subclause=7.8.4.2.1,page=236,line=26):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Text  
==>  
text

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Text  
==>  
text

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5378**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **237** Starting Line # **2**

Fig/Table# Section **7.9.1**

DVJ115(subclause=7.9.1,page=237,line=2):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Flow  
==>  
flow

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Flow  
==>  
flow

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5379**

Comment submitted by: Lei

Wang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **237** Starting Line # **36** Fig/Table# Section **7.9.1**  
 need clarifications

**Suggested Remedy**

1. change the sentence in line 36 page 237 as follows:

A BS transmits the Key Update Command message for the GTEK update mode ~~carrying~~ **carried** on the ~~multicast~~/Broadcast connection after the M&B TEK Grace Time starts.

2. change the sentence in line 5 page 239 as follows:

A BS transmits the second Key Update Command message ~~carrying~~ **carried** on the ~~multicast~~/Broadcast connection after the M&B TEK Grace Time starts.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

1. change the sentence in line 36 page 237 as follows:

A BS transmits the ~~PKMv2 Group~~ **PKMv2 Group** Key Update Command message for the GTEK update mode ~~carrying~~ **carried** on the ~~B~~roadcast connection after the M&B TEK Grace Time starts.

2. change the sentence in line 5 page 239 as follows:

A BS transmits the ~~second~~ **PKMv2 Group** Key Update Command message for the GTEK update mode ~~carrying~~ **carried** on the ~~B~~roadcast connection after the M&B TEK Grace Time starts.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

1. change the sentence in line 36 page 237 as follows:

A BS transmits the ~~PKMv2 Group~~ **PKMv2 Group** Key Update Command message for the GTEK update mode ~~carrying~~ **carried** on the ~~B~~roadcast connection after the M&B TEK Grace Time starts.

2. change the sentence in line 5 page 239 as follows:

A BS transmits the ~~second~~ **PKMv2 Group** Key Update Command message for the GTEK update mode ~~carrying~~ **carried** on the ~~B~~roadcast connection after the M&B TEK Grace Time starts.



Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5380**

Comment submitted by: [Lei](#)

[Wang](#)

Member

[2005/06/08](#)

Comment	Type <a href="#">Editorial</a>	Starting Page # <a href="#">237</a>	Starting Line # <a href="#">46</a>	Fig/Table#	Section <a href="#">7.9.1</a>
<a href="#">typo</a>					

Suggested Remedy  
[change "get" to "gets"](#)

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted** Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[change "get" to "gets"](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5381**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **237** Starting Line # **47**

Fig/Table# Section **7.9.1**

typo

Suggested Remedy

change "has" to "have"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

change "has" to "have"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5382**

Comment submitted by: Ron

Murias

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial	243	4		8.3.5.1.1

The figure from previous contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/093, the figure did not remove all of the ambiguities related to DL subchannelization, as it was not clear from the figure that the subchannelized DL data burst contained concurrent data bursts to multiple subscriber stations and how the control subchannel (CCH) should be used.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt changes suggested in C80216e-05\_093r1.doc

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Adopt changes suggested in C80216e-05\_093r1.doc

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Adopt changes suggested in C80216e-05\_093r1.doc

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

This figure needs to be re-drawn in FrameMaker format.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5383**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	243	Starting Line #	6	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.5.1.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ116(subclause=8.3.5.1.1,page=243,line=6):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Preamble  
(Full BW)  
==>  
Preamble  
(full BW)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Preamble  
(Full BW)  
==>  
Preamble  
(full BW)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5384**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	243	Starting Line #	6	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.5.1.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ117(subclause=8.3.5.1.1,page=243,line=6):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

FCH  
(Full BW)  
==>  
FCH  
(full BW)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

FCH  
(Full BW)  
==>  
FCH  
(full BW)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5385**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	243	Starting Line #	6	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.5.1.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ118(subclause=8.3.5.1.1,page=243,line=6):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

DL Burst #1  
(Full BW)  
==>  
DL burst #1  
(full BW)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

DL Burst #1  
(Full BW)  
==>  
DL burst #1  
(full BW)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5386**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>6</b>		<b>8.3.5.1.1</b>

DVJ119(subclause=8.3.5.1.1,page=243,line=6):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

DL Burst #2  
==>  
DL burst #2

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

DL Burst #2  
==>  
DL burst #2

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5387**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	243	Starting Line #	6	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.5.1.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ120(subclause=8.3.5.1.1,page=243,line=6):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

DL Burst #n

==>

DL burst #n

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

DL Burst #n

==>

DL burst #n

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5388**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **243** Starting Line # **12** Fig/Table# Section **8.3.5.1.1**

DVJ121(subclause=8.3.5.1.1,page=243,line=12):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Sub  
Peramble  
(1/4 BW)

==>  
Sub  
peramble  
(1/4 BW)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Sub  
Peramble  
(1/4 BW)

==>  
Sub  
peramble  
(1/4 BW)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5389**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	243	Starting Line #	12	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.5.1.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ122(subclause=8.3.5.1.1,page=243,line=12):  
 Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Sub Data

Burst

==&gt;

Sub data

burst

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Sub Data

Burst

==&gt;

Sub data

burst

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5390**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	243	Starting Line #	12	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.5.1.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ123(subclause=8.3.5.1.1,page=243,line=12):  
Capitalization within table-column headers should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

Managment  
Messages  
==>  
Managment  
messages

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Managment  
Messages  
==>  
Managment  
messages

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5391**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	248	Starting Line #	2	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.6.3.10
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	------------

DVJ124(subclause=8.3.6.3.10,page=248,line=2):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

tracking Information Element  
==>  
tracking information element

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

tracking Information Element  
==>  
tracking information element

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5392**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	248	14		8.3.6.3.10

DVJ125(subclause=8.3.6.3.10,page=248,line=14):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

tracking Information Element  
==>  
tracking information element

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

tracking Information Element  
==>  
tracking information element

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5393**Comment submitted by: **David V.****James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>8.3.6.6</b>

DVJ126(subclause=8.3.6.6,page=249,line=2):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Private Maps

==&gt;

private maps

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Private Maps

==&gt;

private maps

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5394**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	249	33		8.3.6.6.1

DVJ127(subclause=8.3.6.6.1,page=249,line=33):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Private DL-MAP

==>

private DL-MAP

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Private DL-MAP

==>

private DL-MAP

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5395**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	252	Starting Line #	15	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.6.7
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------

DVJ128(subclause=8.3.6.7,page=252,line=15):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Private Maps

==&gt;

private maps

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Private Maps

==&gt;

private maps

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5396**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	252	Starting Line #	36	Fig/Table#	Section	8.3.6.7.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-----------

DVJ129(subclause=8.3.6.7.1,page=252,line=36):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Private DL-MAP

==&gt;

private DL-MAP

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Private DL-MAP

==&gt;

private DL-MAP

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5397**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **252** Starting Line # **36**

Fig/Table#

Section **8.3.6.7**

Editorial.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the sentence as follows.

If the ~~compressed~~**reduced** private map is used within a DL subchannelization zone it shall use the SBCH\_DL\_MAP\_IE format to describe the DL bursts instead of DL\_MAP\_IE format.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change the sentence as follows.

If the ~~compressed~~**reduced** private map is used within a DL subchannelization zone it shall use the SBCH\_DL\_MAP\_IE format to describe the DL bursts instead of DL\_MAP\_IE format.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5398**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **257** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.3.7.4**

DVJ130(subclause=8.3.7.4,page=257,line=8):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Control

==>

control

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Control

==>

control

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5399**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ131(subclause=8.4,page=257,line=29): Space needed.**

Starting Page # **257**

Starting Line # **29**

Fig/Table#

Section **8.4**

Suggested Remedy  
**Insert after Wireless.**

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

**Insert after Wireless.**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **e) editor disagrees**

**WirelessMAN is correct.**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5400**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **257** Starting Line # **52** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.3.1**

I object the resolution of comment #4214, which did not fully fix the errors.

There exists inconsistency between 802.16e/D8 and 802.16Cor-1/D3 about slot definition. The AMC slot definition is well defined in 802.16Cor-1/D3, but that is redefined incorrectly in 802.16e/D8. Also the slot for downlink optional FUSC is not defined in 802.16e/D8.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Modify the text from page 257, line 62 through page 258, line 9 as followings:]*

- For downlink FUSC ([defined in 8.4.6.1.2.2](#)) and downlink optional FUSC ([defined in 8.4.6.1.2.3](#)) using the distributed subcarrier permutation (~~defined in 8.4.6.1.2.2~~), one slot is one subchannel by one OFDMA symbol.
- For downlink PUSC using the distributed subcarrier permutation (defined in 8.4.6.1.2.1), one slot is one subchannel by two OFDMA symbols.
- For uplink PUSC using either of the distributed subcarrier permutations (defined in 8.4.6.2.1 and 8.4.6.2.5), and for downlink TUSC1 and TUSC2 (defined in 8.4.6.1.2.4 and 8.4.6.1.2.5), one slot is one subchannel by three OFDMA symbols.
- For ~~uplink and downlink using~~ the adjacent subcarrier permutation (defined in 8.4.6.3), one slot is one subchannel by ~~one~~ [two, three or six](#) OFDMA symbols.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[Modify the text from page 257, line 62 through page 258, line 9 as followings:]*

- For downlink FUSC ([defined in 8.4.6.1.2.2](#)) and downlink optional FUSC ([defined in 8.4.6.1.2.3](#)) using the distributed subcarrier permutation (~~defined in 8.4.6.1.2.2~~), one slot is one subchannel by one OFDMA symbol.
- For downlink PUSC using the distributed subcarrier permutation (defined in 8.4.6.1.2.1), one slot is one subchannel by two OFDMA symbols.
- For uplink PUSC using either of the distributed subcarrier permutations (defined in 8.4.6.2.1 and 8.4.6.2.5), and for downlink TUSC1 and TUSC2 (defined in 8.4.6.1.2.4 and 8.4.6.1.2.5), one slot is one subchannel by three OFDMA symbols.
- For ~~uplink and downlink using~~ the adjacent subcarrier permutation (defined in 8.4.6.3), one slot is one subchannel by ~~one~~ [two, three or six](#) OFDMA symbols.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[Modify the text from page 257, line 62 through page 258, line 9 as followings:]*

- For downlink FUSC ([defined in 8.4.6.1.2.2](#)) and downlink optional FUSC ([defined in 8.4.6.1.2.3](#)) using the distributed subcarrier permutation

- ~~(defined in 8.4.6.1.2.2)~~, one slot is one subchannel by one OFDMA symbol.
- For downlink PUSC using the distributed subcarrier permutation (defined in 8.4.6.1.2.1), one slot is one subchannel by two OFDMA symbols.
  - For uplink PUSC using either of the distributed subcarrier permutations (defined in 8.4.6.2.1 and 8.4.6.2.5), and for downlink TUSC1 and TUSC2 (defined in 8.4.6.1.2.4 and 8.4.6.1.2.5), one slot is one subchannel by three OFDMA symbols.
  - For ~~uplink and downlink using~~ the adjacent subcarrier permutation (defined in 8.4.6.3), one slot is one subchannel by ~~one~~ two, three or six OFDMA symbols.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5401**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **258** Starting Line # **62** Fig/Table# Section

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

For each SS, the maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently and directed to the SS is limited by the vaue specified in Max\_Num\_Bursts TLV ~~to 16~~ (including all bursts without CID or with CIDs matching the SS's CIDs). Bursts transmitted concurrently are bursts that share the same OFDMA symbol. Before the MS completed capability exchange BS shall transmit data to the MS at the first data burst specified in the DL-MAP

Add new section

11.7.8.15 Maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently to the MS

Name	Type	Length	Value
Max_Num_Bursts	??	1	Maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently to the MS. Includes all bursts without CID or with CIDs matching the SS's CIDs

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

Replace:

"For each SS, the maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently and directed to the SS is limited to 16 (including all bursts without CID or with CIDs matching the SS's CIDs). Bursts transmitted concurrently are bursts that share the same OFDMA symbol." (...)

Wtih:

"For each MS, the maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently and directed to the MS is limited by the vaue specified in Max\_Num\_Bursts TLV (including all bursts without CID or with CIDs matching the MS's CIDs). Bursts transmitted concurrently are bursts that share the same OFDMA symbol. Before the MS completed capability exchange BS shall transmit data to the MS in the first concurrent data burst per symbol."

Add new section:

11.7.8.15 Maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently to the MS

Name	Type	Length	Value
Max_Num_Bursts	??	1	valid values : 1-16 Maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently to the MS. Includes all bursts without CID or with CIDs matching the MS's CIDs

*[assign type value to appropriate value]*

11.7.8.15 Maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently to the MS

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Replace:

"For each SS, the maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently and directed to the SS is limited to 16 (including all bursts without CID or with CIDs matching the SS's CIDs). Bursts transmitted concurrently are bursts that share the same OFDMA symbol." (...)

With:

"For each MS, the maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently and directed to the MS is limited by the value specified in Max\_Num\_Bursts TLV (including all bursts without CID or with CIDs matching the MS's CIDs). Bursts transmitted concurrently are bursts that share the same OFDMA symbol. Before the MS completed capability exchange BS shall transmit data to the MS in the first concurrent data burst per symbol."

Add new section:

11.7.8.15 Maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently to the MS

Name	Type	Length	Value
Max_Num_Bursts	??	1	valid values : 1-16
			Maximum number of bursts transmitted concurrently to the MS.
			Includes all bursts without CID or with CIDs matching the MS's CIDs
			<i>[assign type value to appropriate value]</i>

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

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Changed type in 11.7.8.9 from 18 to 19 (since we have type 18 in the corrigendum), also remove tracking marks since this is a new section. In 11.7.8.10 added types 20,21 since those were missing. For some reason, we have type 51 in section 11.7.8.11, but I did not touch it. In 11.7.8.12, changed type from 18 to 22 (we already have type 18) In 11.7.8.13 we have also types 160/161, did not touch them. In the new added section (11.7.8.14), assigned type 23. But then I looked ahead... There is a huge mess in type numbering that should be fixed, probably a comment will be a good idea.

Editor's Questions and Concerns



**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5402**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **259** Starting Line # **29** Fig/Table# **268** Section **8.4.4.3**

Ranging\_Change\_Indication was removed from the FCH by the Corrigendum. Should be removed from FCH's for other FFT sizes as well for consistency. Table 268: Ranging\_Change\_Indication is removed by corrigendum -> Change to reserved  
 page 261, line 18, Section 8.4.4.3, Table 268b: Ranging\_Change\_Indication is removed by corrigendum -> Change to reserved

**Suggested Remedy**

Change Table 268 (line 29 on page 259) as follows:

~~"Ranging\_Change\_Indicationreserved"~~

Similarly, change page 261, line 18, in Table 268b as follows:

~~"Ranging\_Change\_Indicationreserved"~~**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Change Table 268 (line 29 on page 259) as follows:

~~"Ranging\_Change\_Indicationreserved"~~

Similarly, change page 261, line 18, in Table 268b as follows:

~~"Ranging\_Change\_Indicationreserved"~~**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change Table 268 (line 29 on page 259) as follows:

~~"Ranging\_Change\_Indicationreserved"~~

Similarly, change page 261, line 18, in Table 268b as follows:

~~"Ranging\_Change\_Indicationreserved"~~**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5403**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	262	Starting Line #	13	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.4.6
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------

DVJ132(subclause=8.4.4.6,page=262,line=13):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Diversity-map Scan

==&gt;

diversity-map scan

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Diversity-map Scan

==&gt;

diversity-map scan

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5404**

Comment submitted by: Peiyong

Zhu

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	264	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	277a	Section	8.4.5.3.2.1
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	------	---------	-------------

The assignment for extended DIUC and extended-2 DIUC is a bit confusing where two reserved fields are used. Suggested to use the number sequentially and leave the reserved field to the end.

**Suggested Remedy**

Modify Table 277a

~~0x09-0x0A reserved~~

0x09 HARQ\_DL\_MAP\_IE

0x0A HARQ ACK IE

~~0x0C-0x0E reserve~~

0x0C Enhanced DL MAP IE

0x0D Closed-loop MIMO DL Enhanced IE

0x0E AAS\_SDMA\_DL\_IE

Modify Table 277c

~~0x07 HARQ\_DL\_MAP\_IE~~~~0x08 HARQ ACK IE~~~~0x09 Enhanced DL MAP IE~~~~0x0A Closed-loop MIMO DL Enhanced IE~~~~0x0B-0x0D reserved~~~~0x0E AAS\_SDMA\_DL\_IE~~~~0x0F Reserved~~

0x07-0x0F Reserved

Make the corresponding changes in the above IEs.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation**

The extended DIUC and extended-2 DIUC have a different number of bits.

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

The extended DIUC and extended-2 DIUC have a different number of bits.

**Group's Notes**

## Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5405**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment            Type Editorial, Satisfied (was            Starting Page # **265**    Starting Line # **18**            Fig/Table#            Section **8.4.5.3.2.2**

DVJ134(subclause=8.4.5.3.2.2,page=265,line=18):  
Fill blanks with a dash.

Suggested Remedy

Do it.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

DVJ134(subclause=8.4.5.3.2.2,page=265,line=18):  
Fill blanks with a dash.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5406**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	265	Starting Line #	20	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.3.2.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------------

DVJ133(subclause=8.4.5.3.2.2,page=265,line=20):  
Too light around body

**Suggested Remedy**

very-thin ==&gt; thin line

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

very-thin ==&gt; thin line

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This is a purely editorial comment. The tight schedule for this re-circ does not permit me the luxury of tweaking cosmetic changes to tables. The IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual section 5.4.3.2 (Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes) reads: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5407**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ135(subclause=8.4.5.3.2.2,page=265,line=35): Unnecessary complex.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	265	35		8.4.5.3.2.2

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Put "(hexadecimal)" under title.
- 2) Remove 0x

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

- 1) Put "(hexadecimal)" under title.
- 2) Remove 0x

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5408**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 266 Starting Line # 48 Fig/Table# Tabl Section 8.4.5.3.3

The table 278 contains the incorrect size field. Correct it as suggested.

**Suggested Remedy**

8.4.5.3.3 AAS IE format  
[Correct the table 278 as follows]

-----

Permutation	<del>23</del>	0b000 = PUSC
		0b001 = FUSC
		0b010 = Optional FUSC
		<del>0b11 = adjacent subcarrier permutation</del>
		0b011 = AMC
		0b100 = TUSC1
		0b101 = TUSC2
		0b110, 0b111 = reserved

-----

:

-----

Reserved	<del>65</del>	Shall be set to zero
----------	---------------	----------------------

-----

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted Recommendation by**

8.4.5.3.3 AAS IE format  
[Correct the table 278 as follows]

-----

Permutation	<del>23</del>	0b000 = PUSC
		0b001 = FUSC
		0b010 = Optional FUSC
		<del>0b11 = adjacent subcarrier permutation</del>
		0b011 = AMC
		0b100 = TUSC1
		0b101 = TUSC2
		0b110, 0b111 = reserved

-----

:

-----

Reserved	<del>65</del>	Shall be set to zero
----------	---------------	----------------------

-----

**Reason for Recommendation**



Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

## 8.4.5.3.3 AAS IE format

[Correct the table 278 as follows]

Permutation	<del>23</del>	0b000 = PUSC 0b001 = FUSC 0b010 = Optional FUSC 0b11 = adjacent subcarrier permutation 0b011 = AMC 0b100 = TUSC1 0b101 = TUSC2 0b110, 0b111 = reserved
Reserved	<del>65</del>	Shall be set to zero

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5409**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **267** Starting Line # **39** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.4**

The first PUSC zone shall be constructed with DL\_PermBase=0 for step2 and DL\_PermBase=preamble IDcell for step 4. However, the current text claims that it only uses DL\_PermBase=0 only. The specific permutation scheme is written in the subcarrier allocation subclause.

**Suggested Remedy**

8.4.5.3.4 Space-Time Coding (STC)/DL\_Zone switch IE format

[Change the second sentence of the first paragraph as follows]

...The downlink frame shall start in PUSC mode with ~~IDcell = 0 and~~ no transmit diversity....**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

8.4.5.3.4 Space-Time Coding (STC)/DL\_Zone switch IE format

[Change the second sentence of the first paragraph as follows]

...The downlink frame shall start in PUSC mode with ~~IDcell = 0 and~~ no transmit diversity....**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

8.4.5.3.4 Space-Time Coding (STC)/DL\_Zone switch IE format

[Change the second sentence of the first paragraph as follows]

...The downlink frame shall start in PUSC mode with ~~IDcell = 0 and~~ no transmit diversity....**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5410**

Comment submitted by: Peiying

Zhu

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **268** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# **279** Section **8.4.5.3.4**

We should allow BS to send 3 byte STC\_Zone\_IE if the BS does not implement features like midamble or dedicated pilots. Since SS is allowed to ignore the remainder of the IE if the length is longer than a known value, there will be no problem for SS to correctly interpret the meaning of this IE. By doing so, we can save some MAC overhead, since we need to use this switch at least once per frame if the permutation for traffic is not PUSC.

**Suggested Remedy**

Modify the Table 279 as follow:

Length	4	length= <del>0x04</del> 0x03 or 0x04
STC	2	0b00 0b01 = STC using <del>2/3 antennas</del> 2 antennas if length = 0x03, otherwise use 2/3 antennas

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation**

The state of 'dedicated pilots' and 'midamble presence' bits will be undefined following this change without providing a default value. The comment does not address that. In addition, this overhead reduction seems negligible: the map will include several tens of bytes of information on the allocations related to the zone, and this proposal will potentially save a single byte.

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

The state of 'dedicated pilots' and 'midamble presence' bits will be undefined following this change without providing a default value. The comment does not address that. In addition, this overhead reduction seems negligible: the map will include several tens of bytes of information on the allocations related to the zone, and this proposal will potentially save a single byte.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5411**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **269** Starting Line # **7** Fig/Table# **279** Section **8.4.5.3.4**

I object the implementation of comment #4478.

There exists inconsistency between 802.16e/D8 and 802.16Cor-1/D3 about STC\_ZONE\_IE. The field of "IDcell" had been changed to "DL\_PermBase" but the IDcell reappear in the 802.16e/D8 document by editorial mistake.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Delete the row of "IDcell 6" from the Table 279 (page 269 line 7) as followings:]*

Table 279. OFDMA downlink STC\_DL\_Zone IE format (continued)

Syntax	Size(bits)	Notes
<del>IDcell</del>	<del>6</del>	
DL_PermBase	5	
...	...	...

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[Delete the row of "IDcell 6" from the Table 279 (page 269 line 7) as followings:]*

Table 279. OFDMA downlink STC\_DL\_Zone IE format (continued)

Syntax	Size(bits)	Notes
<del>IDcell</del>	<del>6</del>	
DL_PermBase	5	
...	...	...

## Reason for Recommendation

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[Delete the row of "IDcell 6" from the Table 279 (page 269 line 7) as followings:]*

Table 279. OFDMA downlink STC\_DL\_Zone IE format (continued)

Syntax	Size(bits)	Notes
<del>IDcell</del>	<del>6</del>	
DL_PermBase	5	
...	...	...

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

## Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5412**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **270** Starting Line # **14** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.4**  
 clarification for the pilot pattern of beamformed spatial channel is needed.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[added the following sentences in line 14 on page 270 (within the description for Dedicated Pilots)]*

When the data allocations are transmitted over m beamformed spatial channels (i.e., spatial rate m) and the Dedicated Pilots bit is set to 1, the pilot pattern for dedicated pilots of m beamformed spatial channels shall be identical to the pilot pattern for m transmit antennas in Section 8.4.8.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

the proposed remedy is not clear

This information is already defined on page 288, lines 43-46. That text is preferable since it is not restricted to 'dedicated pilots' mode, but also applicable to AAS mode (defined through AAS IE and not through STC/zone switch IE).

In addition, 'beamformed spatial channels' and 'spatial rate' are undefined terms.

The pilot patten depends on the number of antennas which is set once per zone.  
 The remedy proposes that the pilot pattern will be allocation dependent. This could work only for AMC permutation.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** ) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5413**Comment submitted by: **Panyuh****Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type <b>Technical, Non-binding</b>	Starting Page # <b>271</b>	Starting Line # <b>2</b>	Fig/Table#	Section <b>8.4.5.3.6</b>
---------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	------------	--------------------------

This comment is for Coordination between 16e/D8 and Cor1/D3.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert the following paragraph into line 2, at page 271.

"

***[Change 8.4.5.3.6 as indicated:]***

In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit DIUC=15 with the Data\_location\_in\_another\_BS\_IE() to indicate that data is transmitted to the SS through another BS. This IE shall be sent right after the IE defining the same data received in the current BS, but it may be sent alone without the IE defining the same data received in the current BS only if the data is to be transmitted in the current frame.

"

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation: <b>Accepted-Modified</b>	Recommendation by
---------------------	--	-------------------

Insert the following paragraph into line 2, at page 271.

"

***[Change 8.4.5.3.6 as indicated:]***

In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit DIUC=15 with the Data\_location\_in\_another\_BS\_IE() to indicate that data is transmitted to the SS through another BS. This IE shall be sent right after the IE defining the same data received in the current BS, but it may be sent alone without the IE defining the same data received in the current BS only if the data is to be transmitted in the current frame.

"

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This is already in the corrigendum, so it is not necessary in this document.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5414**

Comment submitted by: Peiying

Zhu

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **272** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# **283** Section **8.4.5.3.8**

The matrix indicator has been defined in STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE in Table 279. The definition in this Table is not consistent with that in Table 279. Suggest to keep single definition in STC\_SL\_Zone\_IE and refer to it in other place.

**Suggested Remedy**

Modify the Table 282 to

Matrix\_indicator 2 See matrix indicator defined in STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE

Make the same change for Table 284, Table 286f, Table 286g

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Modify Table 283 to

Matrix\_indicator 2 See matrix indicator defined in STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE

Make the same change for Table 284, Table 286f, Table 286g

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Modify Table 283 to

Matrix\_indicator 2 See matrix indicator defined in STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE

Make the same change for Table 284, Table 286f, Table 286g

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5415**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ136(subclause=8.4.5.3.9,page=272,line=47): Be consistent.**

Starting Page # **272** Starting Line # **47**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.9**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Make subclause and table same.**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

**Make subclause and table same.**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

**Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5416**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ137(subclause=8.4.5.3.10,page=273,line=27): Be consistent.**

Starting Page # **273** Starting Line # **27**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.10**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Make subclause and table same.**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

**Make subclause and table same.**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

**Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5417**

Comment submitted by: **Asaf**

**Matatyaou**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **273** Starting Line # **37** Fig/Table# **285** Section **8.4.5.3.10**

The H-ARQ and Sub-MAP Pointer IE is not byte aligned by 3 extra bits present in the reserved field.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove the 3 bit reserved field to byte align the IE:

[Remove from Table 285 the following:]

From Table 285, page 274, lines 37 - 40:

Syntax	Size (bits)	Notes
...		
} <del>else {</del>	-	-
<del>Reserved</del>	<del>3</del>	<del>Shall be set to zero.</del>
<del>}</del>	-	-

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

In Table 285, CID mask include does not exist..

Modify the Table 285 as follows

H-ARQ and Sub- MAP Pointer IE {		
Extended DIUC	4 bits	H-ARQ MAP Pointer = 0x07
Length	4 bits	
While (data remains) {		
DIUC	4 bits	
No. Slots	8 bits	
Repetition Coding Indication	2 bits	0b00 - No repetition coding

Repetition coding indication	2 bits	0000 - No repetition coding 0b01 - Repetition coding of 2 used 0b10 - Repetition coding of 4 used 0b10 - Repetition coding of 6 used
MAP Version	2 bits	0b00 - H-ARQ MAP v1 0b01 - Sub-MAP 0b10 - Sub-MAP with CID Mask included 0b11 - reserved
<u>CID mask included</u>	<u>1 bits</u>	<u>0 - CID mask not included</u> <u>1 - CID mask included</u>
If (CID mask included) {		
Idle users	1 bit	Bursts for Idle users included in the Sub MAP
Sleep users	1 bit	Bursts for Sleep users included in the Sub MAP
CID Mask Length	2 bits	00: 11 bits 01: 19 bits 10: 35 bits 11: 51 bits
CID mask	n bits	n = The number of bits of CID mask is determined by CID Mask Length. When the MAP message pointed by this pointer IE includes any MAP IE for an awake mode MSS, the ((Basic CID of the MSS) MOD n)-the LSB of CID mask shall be set to 1. Otherwise, it may be set to 0..
} else {		
Reserved	3 bits	<u>For a nibble aignment of While-Loop</u> . Shall be set to zero
}		
}		
Reserved	0 or 4 bits	<u>For a byte alignment of IE</u>
}		

}

## Reason for Recommendation

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

In Table 285, CID mask include does not exist..

Modify the Table 285 as follows

H-ARQ and Sub- MAP Pointer IE {		
Extended DIUC	4 bits	H-ARQ MAP Pointer = 0x07
Length	4 bits	
While (data remains) {		
DIUC	4 bits	
No. Slots	8 bits	
Repetition Coding Indication	2 bits	0b00 - No repetition coding 0b01 - Repetition coding of 2 used 0b10 - Repetition coding of 4 used 0b10 - Repetition coding of 6 used
MAP Version	2 bits	0b00 - H-ARQ MAP v1 0b01 - Sub-MAP 0b10 . Sub-MAP with CID Mask included 0b11 - reserved
<u>CID mask included</u>	<u>1 bits</u>	<u>0 - CID mask not included</u> <u>1 - CID mask included</u>
If (CID mask included) {		
Idle users	1 bit	Bursts for Idle users included in the Sub MAP
Sleep users	1 bit	Bursts for Sleep users included in the Sub MAP
CID Mask Length	2 bits	00: 11 bits 01: 19 bits 10: 35 bits 11: 51 bits
CID mask	n bits	n = The number of bits of CID mask is determined

| | by CID Mask Length. When the MAP message pointed  
| | by this pointer IE includes anv MAP IE for an awake mode

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8** Ballot Number: **0001045** Comment Date

Comment # **5418** Comment submitted by: David V. James Member 2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **274** Starting Line # **49** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.11**  
DVJ138(subclause=8.4.5.3.11,page=274,line=49):  
Be consistent.

Suggested Remedy

Make subclause and table same.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Make subclause and table same.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5419**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	275	Starting Line #	11	Fig/Table#	Tabl	Section	8.4.5.3.11
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	------	---------	------------

In 16e, DL/UL Physical Modifier IE formats are modified to add pilot pattern Modifier and pilot pattern Index.

To clarify the location of the new field, Preamble Time shift Index field is also shown without modification.

Preamble Time shift Index field is modified in 802.16-2004 Cor/D3 but not reflected in 16e.

Instead of correcting the field as modified in corrigenda, it is more clear to remove the field that is not relevant to the pilot pattern modifier/Index.

Removing the Preamble Time shift index field, the location of the pilot pattern modifier/Index fields are still clear due to the presence of the reserved field.

**Suggested Remedy**

8.4.5.3.11 DL-MAP Physical modifier IE

[Delete the entry for Preamble Time Shift Index in table 286 on page 275 line 11]

8.4.5.4.~~4~~214

[Delete the entry for Preamble Time Shift Index in table 300 on page 347 line 24]

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

8.4.5.3.11 DL-MAP Physical modifier IE

[Delete the entry for Preamble Time Shift Index in table 286 on page 275 line 11]

8.4.5.4.~~4~~214

[Delete the entry for Preamble Time Shift Index in table 300 on page 347 line 24]

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

8.4.5.3.11 DL-MAP Physical modifier IE

[Delete the entry for Preamble Time Shift Index in table 286 on page 275 line 11]

8.4.5.4.~~4~~214

[Delete the entry for Preamble Time Shift Index in table 300 on page 347 line 24]

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

Regarding the following change:

8.4.5.4.~~4~~214

[Delete the entry for Preamble Time Shift Index in table 300 on page 347 line 24]

An explicit indication of what is the required change for "8.4.5.4.~~4~~214 " could have been helpful, since the correct section for table 300 is 8.4.5.4.12,



and if the intention was to change the section number to .14 then It was not reflected in the comment.

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review:	<b>P802.16e/D8</b>	Ballot Number:	<b>0001045</b>	Comment Date	
Comment #	<b>5420</b>	Comment submitted by:	David V. James	Member	2005/06/08
Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ139(subclause=8.4.5.3.11,page=275,line=23): unclear	Editorial, Satisfied (was	275	23		8.4.5.3.11

#### Suggested Remedy

Put dash in blank cells

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Put dash in blank cells

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5421**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ140(subclause=8.4.5.3.11,page=275,line=26): Unclear.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	275	26		8.4.5.3.11

**Suggested Remedy**

0b precedes binary numbers.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Put dash in blank cells

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5422**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **276** Starting Line # **29** Fig/Table# **286a** Section **8.4.5.3.12**

MBS-MAPIE need some refinement as follows

1. MBS service in Single-BS Access shall use the 16bit-long transport CID instead of 12 bit -long CID (i.e. 12 LSB of CID == Multicast CID) which is in case of Multiple-BS Access.
2. In the table 286a, if-clause for Macro diversity enhanced is for multi-BS access or single-BS access. And, in original contribution, if-clause for DIUC change indication was included in if-clause for Macro diversity enhanced. But, the wrong position of "}" at table 286a make it to totally different form.
3. MBS-MAP IE shall be nibble-aligned. And some parameters need explanations for clear use.
4. 'idcell' shall be replaced with DL PermBase and PRBS ID shall be added according to change in Cor1/D3,

**Suggested Remedy**

change the table 286a as following instrunction

1. In Page 276, Line 56, change the size of CID from 12 to 16.
- 2, 3,4. change line 29~53, page 276 at Table 286a as follows.

```

.....
-----
if(Macro diversity enhanced == 1) {
  Permutation                |    2    | 0b00 = PUSC permutation
                             |         | 0b01 = FUSC permutation
                             |         | 0b10 = Optional FUSC permutation
                             |         | 0b11 = Adjacent subcarrier permutation
-----
idcellDL PermBase        |    65  |
-----
PBRs ID                   |    2   |
-----
}
-----
OFDMA Symbol Offset         |    7    | OFDMA symbol offset with respect to start of the MBS region
-----
DIUC change indication      |    1    | Used to indicate DIUC change is included
-----
Reserved                   |    2   |
-----
if(DIUC change indication == 1) {
  reserved                   |    43  |
-----

```

Boosting	4	Refer to Table 273
DIUC	3	
NO. Subchannels	6	<u>Notify the size of MBS MAP message with NO. OFDMA symbols</u>
NO. OFDMA symbols	<u>26</u>	<u>Notify the size of MBS MAP message with NO. Subchannels</u>
Repetition Coding Information	2	0b00.No repetition coding 0b01.Repetition coding of 2 used 0b10.Repetition coding of 4 used 0b11.Repetition coding of 6 used
}		
} else {		
.....		

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**  
change the table 286a as following instrunction

**Recommendation by**

1. In Page 276, Line 56,  
change the size of CID from 12 to 16.
- 2, 3,4.  
change line 29~53, page 276 at Table 286a as follows.

.....		
If(Macro diversity enhanced == 1) {		
Permutation	2	0b00 = PUSC permutation 0b01 = FUSC permutation 0b10 = Optional FUSC permutation 0b11 = Adjacent subcarrier permutation
<del>Idcell</del> <u>DL PermBase</u>	<u>65</u>	
<u>PBRS ID</u>	<u>2</u>	
}		
OFDMA Symbol Offset	7	OFDMA symbol offset with respect to start of the MBS region
DIUC change indication	1	Used to indicate DIUC change is included

<u>Reserved</u>	2	
if(DIUC change indication == 1) {		
reserved	43	
Boosting	4	Refer to Table 273
DIUC	3	
NO. Subchannels	6	<u>Indication of burst size of MBS MAP message with the number of subchannels</u>
NO. OFDMA symbols	26	<u>Indication of burst size of MBS MAP message with the number of OFDMA symbols</u>
Repetition Coding Information	2	0b00.No repetition coding 0b01.Repetition coding of 2 used 0b10.Repetition coding of 4 used 0b11.Repetition coding of 6 used
}		
} else {		
.....		

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**                      **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

change the table 286a as following instrunction

1. In Page 276, Line 56,  
change the size of CID from 12 to 16.
- 2, 3,4.  
change line 29~53, page 276 at Table 286a as follows.

if(Macro diversity enhanced == 1) {		
Permutation	2	0b00 = PUSC permutation 0b01 = FUSC permutation 0b10 = Optional FUSC permutation 0b11 = Adjacent subcarrier permutation

0011 = Adjacent subcarrier permutation

DL PermBase	65	
PBRS ID	2	
OFDMA Symbol Offset	7	OFDMA symbol offset with respect to start of the MBS region
DIUC change indication	1	Used to indicate DIUC change is included
Reserved	2	
if(DIUC change indication == 1) {		
reserved	43	
Boosting	4	Refer to Table 273
DIUC	3	
NO. Subchannels	6	Indication of burst size of MBS MAP message with the number of subchannels
NO. OFDMA symbols	26	Indication of burst size of MBS MAP message with the number of OFDMA symbols
Repetition Coding Information	2	0b00.No repetition coding

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5423**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **276**

Starting Line # **39**

Fig/Table# **286a**

Section **8.4.5.3.12**

**Byte Aligement.**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Change the length of 'Reserved' from 1 to 3 for byte alignment.**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superceded****

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

**See comment 5422**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5424**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **276** Starting Line # **56** Fig/Table# **286a** Section **8.4.5.3.12**

MBS-MAPIE need some refinement as follows

- 1 MBS service in Single-BS Access shall use the 16bit-long transport CID instead of 12 bit -long CID (i.e. 12 LSB of CID) which is in case of Multiple-BS Access.
- 2 MBS-MAP IE shall be nibble-aligned.
- 3 PermBase
4. In case of Multiple-BS Access, MAP MBS may be simultaneously transmitted from all the BSs in an MBS zone, for macro diversity. In this case, the MBS\_MAP must be transmitted with same RF signal from all BS transmitting it. For the common transmission the PRBS pattern should be common for all transmitters. PRBS pattern need to be added in MBS-MAP IE for macro diversity.

**Suggested Remedy**

change the table 286a as following instrunction

1. In Page 276, Line 56,  
change the size of CID from 12 to 16.
- 2.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superceded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5422.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5425**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Non-binding	277	46		8.4.5.3.12

The explanation on the position of MBS MAP message was removed by a mistake.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the followings after line 46, page 277 at the end of table 286a

At the MBS region, MBS MAP message are located from the first subchannel and first OFDM symbol of MBS region

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

Recommendation by

Add the followings after line 46, page 277 at the end of table 286a

At the MBS region, MBS MAP message are located from the first subchannel and first OFDM symbol of MBS region

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Add the followings after line 46, page 277 at the end of table 286a

At the MBS region, MBS MAP message are located from the first subchannel and first OFDM symbol of MBS region

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5426**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **278** Starting Line # **23** Fig/Table# **286** Section **8.4.5.3.13**

Replace 'IDcell' with 'DL\_PermBase' and add 'PRBS\_ID' in table 286b, according to the changes in IEEE P802.16-2004/Cor1/D3.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change table 286b as follows:

<del>IDcell</del>	<del>5</del>	<del>Cell ID for other BS's sector</del>
<u>DL_PermBase</u>	<u>5</u>	
<u>PRBS_ID</u>	<u>2</u>	
.....	.....	.....
reserved	<u>64</u>	Shall be set to zero

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change table 286b as follows:

<u>DL_PermBase</u>	<u>5</u>	
<u>PRBS_ID</u>	<u>2</u>	
.....	.....	.....
reserved	<u>67</u>	Shall be set to zero

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change table 286b as follows:

<u>DL_PermBase</u>	<u>5</u>	
--------------------	----------	--

<u>PRBS_ID</u>	2	
.....	.....	.....
reserved	67	Shall be set to zero

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5427**

Comment submitted by: Peiyong

Zhu

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	282	Starting Line #	6	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.3.17
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	------------

Change the sentence "In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit DIUC=14 with the MIMO\_in\_another\_anchor\_BA\_IE()...' to "In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit ~~DIUC=14 with the MIMO\_in\_another\_anchor\_BA\_IE()...~~"

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the sentence "In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit DIUC=14 with the MIMO\_in\_another\_anchor\_BA\_IE()...' to "In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit ~~DIUC=14 with the MIMO\_in\_another\_anchor\_BA\_IE()...~~"

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Change the sentence "In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit DIUC=14 with the MIMO\_in\_another\_anchor\_BA\_IE()...' to "In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit ~~DIUC=14 with the MIMO\_in\_another\_anchor\_BA\_IE()...~~"

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change the sentence "In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit DIUC=14 with the MIMO\_in\_another\_anchor\_BA\_IE()...' to "In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit ~~DIUC=14 with the MIMO\_in\_another\_anchor\_BA\_IE()...~~"

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5428**

Comment submitted by: [Seokheon](#)

[Cho](#)

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **282** Starting Line # **18** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.17**

In IEEE P802.16e/D8, some MAP IEs are not nibble aligned during for-loop operation. For fast MAP decoding with low implementation complexity, we need a nibble alignment during for-loop operation in MAP IEs.

**Suggested Remedy**

[Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/271](#)

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

[Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/271r2.](#)

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

[Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/271r2.](#)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5429**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **285** Starting Line # **12** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.18**  
 DVJ141(subclause=8.4.5.3.18,page=285,line=12):  
 This shorthand is unacceptable.

**Suggested Remedy**

Not sure how to fix, but assigning a constant to a variable is unacceptable.

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

```
[Change as indicated (replace '=' with ':')]
if (STC == 0b01 and Ant23 == 0) {
    0b00 := Matrix A
    0b01 := Matrix B
    0b10 := Matrix C
    0b11 := Reserved
}
elseif (STC == 0b01 and Ant23 == 1) or (STC == 0b10){
    0b00 := Matrix A
    0b01 := Matrix B
    0b10 := Matrix C
    0b11 := Reserved
}
else {
    0b00-0b11 := Reserved
}
```

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

```
[Change as indicated (replace '=' with ':')]
if (STC == 0b01 and Ant23 == 0) {
    0b00 := Matrix A
    0b01 := Matrix B
    0b10 := Matrix C
    0b11 := Reserved
}
elseif (STC == 0b01 and Ant23 == 1) or (STC == 0b10){
    0b00 := Matrix A
    0b01 := Matrix B
    0b10 := Matrix C
    0b11 := Reserved
}
```

```
else {  
    0b00-0b11 := Reserved  
}
```

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    [l\) none needed](#)

[Fixed by another comment.](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5430**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ142(subclause=8.4.5.3.20,page=288,line=5): Inconsistent.

Starting Page # **288** Starting Line # **5**Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.20****Suggested Remedy**

'control' should be capitalized same in title and text.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

'control' should be capitalized same in title and text.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5431**Comment submitted by: **David V.****James****Member****2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **289** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.20.1**  
 DVJ143(subclause=8.4.5.3.20.1,page=289,line=28):  
 Line widths wrong.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make them right &amp; consistent.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

DVJ143(subclause=8.4.5.3.20.1,page=289,line=28):  
 Line widths wrong.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This is a purely editorial comment. The tight schedule for this re-circ does not permit me the luxury of tweaking cosmetic changes to tables. The IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual section 5.4.3.2 (Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes) reads: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5432**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	290	26		8.4.5.3.20.1

DVJ144(subclause=8.4.5.3.20.1,page=290,line=26):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Decoding  
==>  
decoding

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Decoding  
==>  
decoding

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5433**

Comment submitted by: Peiyong

Zhu

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **291** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

Many sentences in this standard cause ambiguous whether a feature is mandatory or optional. Suggest to change these sentences to make it explicit.

For example, we should change the following sentence to

"The following modes of HARQ are supported by HARQ DL MAP IE" to The following modes of HARQ may be supported by HARQ DL MAP IE"

**Suggested Remedy**

Modify the sentence to

The following modes of HARQ are **may be** supported by HARQ DL MAP IE

On page 290 line 35, change

This IE is **may be** sent by BS in the ....

on page 310 in section 8.4.5.3.24

This IE is **may be** used by BS to assign ....

On page 309

This IE is **may be** used ~~by~~ for BS to indicate to the MS the SL resource allocation

On page 357, line 12

The UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE in UL-MAP entry is **may be** used to provide fast power,

On page 358, line 9

The Anchor\_BS\_switch\_IE is **may be** sent by ....

On page 360 line 59

The following modes of HARQ are **may be** supported by HARQ UL MAP IE

On page 372, line 63

This IE is **may be** used by BS to define a UL region to include one or more ACK channel(s) for HARQ supporting

On page 377, line 4

This IE **may be** used by BS to schedule Feedback header transmission by the MS.

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**      **Recommendation by**

On page 291, line 32, modify the sentence to:  
The following modes of HARQ are **shall be** supported by HARQ DL MAP IE

On page 290 line 35, change  
This IE is **may be** send by BS in the ....

on page 310 in section 8.4.5.3.24  
This IE is **may be** used by BS to assign ....

On page 309  
This IE is **may be** used **by** ~~for~~BS to indicate to the MS the SL resource allocation

On page 357, line 12  
The UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE in UL-MAP entry is **may be** used to provide fast power,

On page 358, line 9  
The Anchor\_BS\_switch\_IE is **may be** sent by ....

On page 360 line 59  
The following modes of HARQ are **shall be** supported by HARQ UL MAP IE

On page 372, line 63  
This IE is **may be** used by BS to define a UL region to include one or more ACK channel(s) for HARQ supporting

On page 377, line 4  
This IE **may be** used by BS to schedule Feedback header transmission by the MS.

Also, adopt contribution C80216e\_05\_306.

#### **Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

On page 291, line 32, modify the sentence to:  
The following modes of HARQ are **shall be** supported by HARQ DL MAP IE

On page 290 line 35, change  
This IE is **may be** send by BS in the ....

on page 310 in section 8.4.5.3.24  
This IE is **may be** used by BS to assign ....

On page 309  
This IE is **may be** used **by** ~~for~~BS to indicate to the MS the SL resource allocation

On page 357, line 12

The UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE in UL-MAP entry is **may be** used to provide fast power,

On page 358, line 9

The Anchor\_BS\_switch\_IE is **may be** sent by ....

On page 360 line 59

The following modes of HARQ are **shall be** supported by HARQ UL MAP IE

On page 372, line 63

This IE is **may be** used by BS to define a UL region to include one or more ACK channel(s) for HARQ supporting

On page 377, line 4

This IE **may be** used by BS to schedule Feedback header transmission by the MS.

Also, adopt contribution C80216e\_05\_306.

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5434**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	291	Starting Line #	42	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.3.21
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

The description of the HARQ DL/UL IEs states that they may also be used to indicate a non-H-ARQ transmission. This is currently not the case (at least it is not clear how), nor does it seem to have any value.

**Suggested Remedy**

In Section 8.4.5.3.21, page 291: Remove line 42:

~~"The IE may also be used to indicate a non-HARQ transmission."~~

Also, in Section 8.4.5.4.24, page 361: Remove line 6:

~~"The IE may also be used to indicate also a non-HARQ transmission."~~**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

In Section 8.4.5.3.21, page 291: Remove line 42:

~~"The IE may also be used to indicate a non-HARQ transmission."~~

Also, in Section 8.4.5.4.24, page 361: Remove line 6:

~~"The IE may also be used to indicate also a non-HARQ transmission."~~**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

If 'ACK disable' field of DL/UL HARQ sub-burst IEs is set to '0', it indicates a non H-ARQ transmission. Hence, the sentence should not be deleted.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5435**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ146(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=293,line=5): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

Starting Page # **293** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Size (bits)

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Size (bits)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5436**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ145(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=293,line=38): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **293** Starting Line # **38**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5437**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **295** Starting Line # **22** Fig/Table# **286** Section **8.4.5.3.21**

'Else if' on Page 295, Line 22 is wrong because Dedicated DL control Indicator is composed of 2 bit-wise parameters. Therefore, the respective bit should be used independently irrespective of each other.

'Else if' on Page 296, Line 38 (Table 286n) is also wrong due to the same reason.

'Else if' on Page 298, Line 33 (Table 286o) is also wrong due to the same reason.

**Suggested Remedy**

In Page 295, Line 22,  
change 'Else if' to 'If' .  
In Page 296, Line 38,  
change 'Else if' to 'If' .  
In Page 298, Line 33,  
change 'Else if' to 'If' .

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

In Page 295, Line 22,  
change  
} ~~Elseif (LSB #1 of Dedicated DL Control~~  
**If (LSB #1 of Dedicated DL Control**  
Indicator ==1) {

Make similar change in Page 296, Line 38,

In Page 298, Line 33,

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

In Page 295, Line 22,  
change  
} ~~Elseif (LSB #1 of Dedicated DL Control~~  
**If (LSB #1 of Dedicated DL Control**  
Indicator ==1) {

Make similar change in Page 296 Line 38

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

make similar change in Page 200, Line 30,

In Page 298, Line 33,

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5438**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ147(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=297,line=25): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **297** Starting Line # **25**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5439**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **299** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# **286** Section **8.4.5.3.21**

In Page 299, Line 10,  
In MIMO DL Chase HARQ sub-burst IE, the values of the field 'Size(bits)' are misplaced.  
In Page 306, Line 51,  
In Dedicated MIMO DL Control IE, some parameters are duplicated.

**Suggested Remedy**

In Page 299, Line 10,  
Move down all the values of the field 'Size(bits)' by 1 line.  
In Page 306, Line 51,  
Remove the lines from 51 to 62 in page 306 and from 7 to 35 in page 307.

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted**

In Page 299, Line 10,  
Move down all the values of the field 'Size(bits)' by 1 line.  
In Page 306, Line 51,  
Remove the lines from 51 to 62 in page 306 and from 7 to 35 in page 307.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5440**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ148(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=299,line=12): blank cells.

Starting Page # 299 Starting Line # 12

Fig/Table# Section 8.4.5.3.21

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5441**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **299** Starting Line # **36** Fig/Table# **286** Section **8.4.5.3.21**

1. Editorial : change 'Length' to 'Duration' (be consistent with other IE)
2. Editorial : [line 8 - line 49 in page 306] are duplicates of [ the line 50, page 306 ~ line 35, page 307]  
Delete [the text in page 306, line 8 - line 49]
3. definition of Matrix field is needed. (be consistent with matrix\_indicator of closed-loop MIMO DL enhanced IE)

**Suggested Remedy**

1.  
[page 299 line 36 in Table 286p]  
~~Length~~Duration  
[page 301 line 62 in Table 286r]  
~~Length~~Duration  
[page 303 line 22 in Table 286s]  
~~Length~~Duration

2.  
[Delete line 8 - line 49 in page 306 within Table 286t]

3.  
[add the notes in line 26 page 305 within Table 286t]

...

---

Matrix	2 bits	Indicates transmission matrix (See 8.4.8)
		0b00 = Matrix A
		0b01 = Matrix B
		0b10 = Matrix C
		0b11 = Codebook

---

...

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted** Recommendation by

1.  
[page 299 line 36 in Table 286p]  
~~Length~~Duration  
[page 301 line 62 in Table 286r]  
~~Length~~Duration  
[page 303 line 22 in Table 286s]

*[page 300 line 22 in Table 286t]*  
**Length**Duration

2.

*[Delete line 8 - line 49 in page 306 within Table 286t]*

3.

*[add the notes in line 26 page 305 within Table 286t]*

...

Matrix	2 bits	Indicates transmission matrix (See 8.4.8)
		0b00 = Matrix A
		0b01 = Matrix B
		0b10 = Matrix C
		0b11 = Codebook

...

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

1.

*[page 299 line 36 in Table 286p]*  
**Length**Duration  
*[page 301 line 62 in Table 286r]*  
**Length**Duration  
*[page 303 line 22 in Table 286s]*  
**Length**Duration

2.

*[Delete line 8 - line 49 in page 306 within Table 286t]*

3.

*[add the notes in line 26 page 305 within Table 286t]*

...

Matrix	2 bits	Indicates transmission matrix (See 8.4.8)
		0b00 = Matrix A
		0b01 = Matrix B
		0b10 = Matrix C
		0b11 = Codebook

...

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5442**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **299** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**  
 DVJ149(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=299,line=53):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5443**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ151(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=300,line=16): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	300	16		8.4.5.3.21

**Suggested Remedy**

Format

==&gt;

format

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Format

==&gt;

format

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5444**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ150(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=300,line=21): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **300** Starting Line # **21**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5445**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **301** Starting Line # **17** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**  
 DVJ154(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=301,line=17):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5446**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ152(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=301,line=31): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **301** Starting Line # **31**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5447**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ153(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=301,line=37): redundant

Starting Page # **301** Starting Line # **37**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

Suggested Remedy  
bits ==> (deleted),  
here and following cells

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

bits ==> (deleted),  
here and following cells

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5448**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ155(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=302,line=9): Wrong line widths.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	302	9		8.4.5.3.21

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5449**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ156(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=303,line=10): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **303** Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5450**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ157(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=303,line=16): redundant

Starting Page # **303** Starting Line # **16**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21**

Suggested Remedy  
bits ==> (deleted),  
here and following cells

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

bits ==> (deleted),  
here and following cells

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5451**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	304	Starting Line #	9	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.3.21
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	------------

DVJ158(subclause=8.4.5.3.21,page=304,line=9):  
Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5452**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ160(subclause=8.4.5.3.21.1,page=305,line=10): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **305** Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21.1**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5453**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	305	Starting Line #	11	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.3.21.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

DVJ159(subclause=8.4.5.3.21.1,page=305,line=11):  
redundant

**Suggested Remedy**

bits ==> (deleted),  
here and following cells

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

bits ==> (deleted),  
here and following cells

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5454**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **307** Starting Line # **16** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.21.1**  
 DVJ161(subclause=8.4.5.3.21.1,page=307,line=16):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5455**Comment submitted by: **Asaf****Matatyaou****Other****2005/06/08**Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **308** Starting Line # **60** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.22**

A variable-sized Bitmap field is defined as part of the DL HARQ ACK IE, but with no mention of the definitions for the values of the bits within the bitmap.

**Suggested Remedy**

Define the values of the bits for the bitmap in a manner similar to that defined for the UL ACK channel defined in section 8.4.5.4.17, Optional Enhanced UL ACK channels.

## 8.4.5.3.22 DL HARQ ACK IE

[Add the following text to section 8.4.5.3.22, to the end of the Bitmap definition:]

**Bitmap**

Includes HARQ ACK information for HARQ enabled UL bursts. The size of BITMAP should be equal or larger than the number of HARQ enabled UL-bursts. Each byte carries 8 ACK indications ordered from LSB (smallest index ACK channel) to MSB. An acknowledgement bit shall be 0 (ACK) if the corresponding uplink packet has been successfully received; otherwise, it shall be 1 (NAK).

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Define the values of the bits for the bitmap in a manner similar to that defined for the UL ACK channel defined in section 8.4.5.4.17, Optional Enhanced UL ACK channels.

## 8.4.5.3.22 DL HARQ ACK IE

[Add the following text to section 8.4.5.3.22, to the end of the Bitmap definition:]

**Bitmap**

Includes HARQ ACK information for HARQ enabled UL bursts. The size of BITMAP should be equal or larger than the number of HARQ enabled UL-bursts. Each byte carries 8 ACK indications ordered from LSB (smallest index ACK channel) to MSB. An acknowledgement bit shall be 0 (ACK) if the corresponding uplink packet has been successfully received; otherwise, it shall be 1 (NAK).

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Define the values of the bits for the bitmap in a manner similar to that defined for the UL ACK channel defined in section 8.4.5.4.17, Optional

Enhanced UL ACK channels.

#### 8.4.5.3.22 DL HARQ ACK IE

[Add the following text to section 8.4.5.3.22, to the end of the Bitmap definition:]

##### **Bitmap**

Includes HARQ ACK information for HARQ enabled UL bursts. The size of BITMAP should be equal or larger than the number of HARQ enabled UL-bursts. Each byte carries 8 ACK indications ordered from LSB (smallest index ACK channel) to MSB. An acknowledgement bit shall be 0 (ACK) if the corresponding uplink packet has been successfully received; otherwise, it shall be 1 (NAK).

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5456**Comment submitted by: **Mo-Han****Fong**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **310** Starting Line # **63**

Fig/Table#

Section **8.4.5.3.24**

I object to the text change related to comment #4260, because some editorial correction is required.

**Suggested Remedy**

[Modify page 310, line 63 as follows]

Elseif (Matrix indicator == 11)

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

[Modify page 310, line 63 as follows]

Elseif (Matrix indicator == 11)

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5457**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **311** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.24**  
 DVJ162(subclause=8.4.5.3.24,page=311,line=32):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5458**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ163(subclause=8.4.5.3.25,page=312,line=35): blank cells.

Starting Page # **312** Starting Line # **35**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.25**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5459**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **313** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# **286y** Section **8.4.5.3.26**

Each AAS SDMA DL IE and AAS SDMA UL IE shall be nibble-aligned. When there is an if-else clause, regardless of whether the 'if' clause or the 'else' clause is executed the resulting Map IE shall be nibble-aligned. When there is a loop, nibblealignment shall be required before the loop starts and inside the loop.

And corrects the editorial mistakes.

**Suggested Remedy**

discuss and adopt the contribution C80216e-05\_268.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt contribution C80216e-05\_268 with the following additional corrections:

1) table 286y (AAS\_SDMA\_DL\_IE), p. 313, lines 27-44:

```

If (Zone Permutation is AMC, TUSC1, or TUSC2 = 0b11) { —For the AMC permutation (2 x 3 type)
    Subchannel offset      8
    No. OFDMA triple symbols  5          Number of OFDMA symbols is given in multiples of 3
    No. subchannels        6
Else {
    Subchannel offset      6
    No. OFDMA triple symbols  7
    No. subchannels        6
}

```

2) in table 316a (UL Sounding Command IE), p. 415, line 53: replace IDcell with 'DL\_PermBase'.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Adopt contribution C80216e-05\_268 with the following additional corrections:

1) table 286y (AAS\_SDMA\_DL\_IE), p. 313, lines 27-44:

```

If (Zone Permutation is AMC, TUSC1, or TUSC2 = 0b11) { —For the AMC permutation (2 x 3 type)
    Subchannel offset      8
    No. OFDMA triple symbols  5          Number of OFDMA symbols is given in multiples of 3
    No. subchannels        6
Else {

```

```

-100 {
  Subchannel offset          6
  No. OFDMA triple symbols  7
  No. subchannels           6
}

```

2) in table 316a (UL Sounding Command IE), p. 415, line 53: replace IDcell with 'DL\_PermBase'.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5460**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ164(subclause=8.4.5.3.26,page=313,line=10): blank cells.

Starting Page # **313** Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.26**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5461**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **313** Starting Line # **12**

Fig/Table# **286y** Section **8.4.5.3.26**

Editorial. Change Extended-2 UIUC in AAS\_SDMA\_DL\_IE to Extended-2 DIUC.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change Extended-2 UIUC in AAS\_SDMA\_DL\_IE to Extended-2 DIUC.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change Extended-2 UIUC in AAS\_SDMA\_DL\_IE to Extended-2 DIUC.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5462**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ165(subclause=8.4.5.3.26,page=315,line=47): Wrong line widths.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	315	47		8.4.5.3.26

Suggested Remedy  
[Fix them](#)

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation:      Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group      Decision of Group: **Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    [l\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5463**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ166(subclause=8.4.5.3.27,page=316,line=16): blank cells.

Starting Page # **316** Starting Line # **16**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.27**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5464**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **316** Starting Line # **17** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.27**  
 DVJ167(subclause=8.4.5.3.27,page=316,line=17):  
 Inconsistent.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) In heading, put "(bits)"
- 2) Remove bits within cells.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

- 1) In heading, put "(bits)"
- 2) Remove bits within cells.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5465**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **316** Starting Line # **35** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.3.27**  
 DVJ168(subclause=8.4.5.3.27,page=316,line=35):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5466**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **317** Starting Line # **24** Fig/Table# **Tabl** Section **8.4.5.4**  
 UL-MAP IE is different from UL-MAP IE in 802.16-2004 Cor1/D3. Correct it as suggested.

**Suggested Remedy**

8.4.5.4 UL-MAP IE format

[Insert the following between line 51 and line 52]

Syntax size Notes  
 } else if (UIUC == 13) {  
 PAPR Reduction and Safety Zone Allocation IE() 32

[Insert the following between line 51 and line 52]

Syntax size Notes  
 } else if (UIUC == 0) {  
 FAST-FEEDBACK Allocation IE() 32

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

8.4.5.4 UL-MAP IE format

[Insert the following between line 51 and line 52]

Syntax size Notes  
 } else if (UIUC == 13) {  
 PAPR Reduction and Safety Zone Allocation IE() 32

[Insert the following between line 51 and line 52]

Syntax size Notes  
 } else if (UIUC == 0) {  
 FAST-FEEDBACK Allocation IE() 32

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Already in the corrigendum.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** ) none needed

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5467**

Comment submitted by: **Rajesh Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **318** Starting Line # **7**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4**

The "if (UIUC==11) "loop shouldn't be inside "if (UIUC==14)" loop.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change Table 287 as the following:

Syntax	Size	Notes
.....	....	....
} else if(UIUC ==14 ) {	-	-
CDMA_Allocation_IE()	32	-
} else if (UIUC == 11 ) {		
Extended UIUC 2 depedent IE	Variable	
<del>+</del>		
} else if (UIUC == 15 ) {		
.....	...	...

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment #5468](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **l) none needed**

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5468**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	318	Starting Line #	7	Fig/Table#	287	Section	8.4.5.4
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	-----	---------	---------

There is wrong reference to Extended UIUC 2 dependent IE.

And, The parenthesis 'if(UIUC == 11){....}' is misplaced. It is included in the parenthesis 'if(UIUC == 14){....}'.

## Suggested Remedy

1. Change the note for Extended UIUC 2 depedent IE as follows

See [the](#) subclauses following ~~8.4.5.4.3~~ [8.4.5.4.4.2](#)

2. Move the parenthesis 'if(UIUC == 11){....}' from line 7 on page 318 to line 34 on page 317.

3. Then, change the parenthesis 'if(UIUC == 12)' in line 35 on page 317 to 'else if(UIUC == 12)'.

## Proposed Resolution

## Recommendation:

## Recommendation by

## Reason for Recommendation

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

1. Change the note for Extended UIUC 2 depedent IE as follows

See [the](#) subclauses following ~~8.4.5.4.3~~ [8.4.5.4.4.2](#)

2. Move the parenthesis 'if(UIUC == 11){....}' from line 7 on page 318 to line 34 on page 317.

3. Then, change the parenthesis 'if(UIUC == 12)' in line 35 on page 317 to 'else if(UIUC == 12)'.

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

## Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5469**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 320 Starting Line # 13 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.5.4.4.1  
 DVJ170(subclause=8.4.5.4.4.1,page=320,line=13):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5470**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 320 Starting Line # 47 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.5.4.4.2  
 DVJ169(subclause=8.4.5.4.4.2,page=320,line=47):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5471**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **321** Starting Line # **27** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.4.2**  
 DVJ171(subclause=8.4.5.4.4.2,page=321,line=27):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5472**

Comment submitted by: Peiying

Zhu

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	321	Starting Line #	64	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.4.10.2
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

The paragraph uses mixed MS and SS, should use the consistent term.

**Suggested Remedy**

When CQI Feedback Type field in CQICH\_Enhanced\_Alloc\_IE() (see 8.4.5.4.15) is 0b011 and CQICH type is 0b101, the MS shall report the MIMO coefficient the BS should use for best DL reception. The mapping for the complex weights is shown in Figure 231. For this type of feedback, if N is the number of BS transmit antennas, then (N-1) CQICH shall be allocated to the ~~SS~~ MS and ~~SS~~ MS shall report the desired antenna weights of antenna 1 through N-1 based on antenna 0.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

When CQI Feedback Type field in CQICH\_Enhanced\_Alloc\_IE() (see 8.4.5.4.15) is 0b011 and CQICH type is 0b101, the MS shall report the MIMO coefficient the BS should use for best DL reception. The mapping for the complex weights is shown in Figure 231. For this type of feedback, if N is the number of BS transmit antennas, then (N-1) CQICH shall be allocated to the ~~SS~~ MS and ~~SS~~ MS shall report the desired antenna weights of antenna 1 through N-1 based on antenna 0.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5473**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **323** Starting Line # **31** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.10.3**  
 DVJ172(subclause=8.4.5.4.10.3,page=323,line=31):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5474**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **323**

Starting Line # **49**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.5.4.10.4**

Incorrect crossreference.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the text as follows:

"through the CQICH\_Enhanced\_Alloc\_IE() (see ~~8.4.5.4.12.18.4.5.4.15~~)"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change the text as follows:

"through the CQICH\_Enhanced\_Alloc\_IE() (see ~~8.4.5.4.12.18.4.5.4.15~~)"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5475**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **323**

Starting Line # **49**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.5.4.10.4**

Wrong cross reference

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the text as follows:

"through the CQICH\_Enhanced\_Alloc\_IE() (see ~~8.4.5.4.12.1~~[8.4.5.4.15](#).)"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change the text as follows:

"through the CQICH\_Enhanced\_Alloc\_IE() (see ~~8.4.5.4.12.1~~[8.4.5.4.15](#).)"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5476**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	323	Starting Line #	53	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.4.10.4
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

1. To be consistent with name of 3 bit-MIMO Fast-feedback and Enchanded Fast-feedback control channel.
2. Wrong reference Table in text.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[modify the text in line 53 page 323 ~ line 3 page 324 (section 8.4.5.4.10.4) as following ]*

Each ~~enhanced~~ 3bit-MIMO Fast-feedback slot consists of 1/2 OFDMA slots mapped in a manner similar to the mapping of ACK Channel. An enhanced Fast-feedback slot uses QPSK modulation on the 24 data subcarriers it contains, and can carry a data payload of 3 bits. Table 298b defines the mapping between the payload bit sequences and the subcarriers modulation.

*[modify text in line 28~33 page 324 (section 8.4.5.4.10.4) as following]*

Each enhanced Fast-feedback slot consists of 1 OFDMA slots mapped in a manner similar to the mapping of normal uplink data. An enhanced Fast-feedback slot uses QPSK modulation on the 48 data subcarriers it contains, and can carry a data payload of 6 bits. Table ~~296a~~298c defines the mapping between the payload bit sequences and the subcarriers modulation.

*[change the title of table 238c (page 324 line 38; page 325 line 1; page 326 line 1) as following]*

Table 298c. Enhanced Fast-feedback channel subcarrier modulation

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

*[modify the text in line 53 page 323 ~ line 3 page 324 (section 8.4.5.4.10.4) as following ]*

Each ~~enhanced~~ 3bit-MIMO Fast-feedback slot consists of 1/2 OFDMA slots mapped in a manner similar to the mapping of ACK Channel. An enhanced Fast-feedback slot uses QPSK modulation on the 24 data subcarriers it contains, and can carry a data payload of 3 bits. Table 298b defines the mapping between the payload bit sequences and the subcarriers modulation.

*[modify text in line 28~33 page 324 (section 8.4.5.4.10.4) as following]*

Each enhanced Fast-feedback slot consists of 1 OFDMA slots mapped in a manner similar to the mapping of normal uplink data. An enhanced Fast-feedback slot uses QPSK modulation on the 48 data subcarriers it contains, and can carry a data payload of 6 bits. Table ~~296a~~298c defines the mapping between the payload bit sequences and the subcarriers modulation.

*[change the title of table 238c (page 324 line 38; page 325 line 1; page 326 line 1) as following]*

*[change the title of table 298c (page 324 line 38; page 325 line 1; page 326 line 1) as following]*

Table 298c. Enhanced Fast-feedback channel subcarrier modulation

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

*[modify the text in line 53 page 323 ~ line 3 page 324 (section 8.4.5.4.10.4) as following ]*

Each ~~enhanced~~ 3bit-MIMO Fast-feedback slot consists of 1/2 OFDMA slots mapped in a manner similar to the mapping of ACK Channel. An enhanced Fast-feedback slot uses QPSK modulation on the 24 data subcarriers it contains, and can carry a data payload of 3 bits. Table 298b defines the mapping between the payload bit sequences and the subcarriers modulation.

*[modify text in line 28~33 page 324 (section 8.4.5.4.10.4) as following]*

Each enhanced Fast-feedback slot consists of 1 OFDMA slots mapped in a manner similar to the mapping of normal uplink data. An enhanced Fast-feedback slot uses QPSK modulation on the 48 data subcarriers it contains, and can carry a data payload of 6 bits. Table ~~296a~~ 298c defines the mapping between the payload bit sequences and the subcarriers modulation.

*[change the title of table 238c (page 324 line 38; page 325 line 1; page 326 line 1) as following]*

Table 298c. Enhanced Fast-feedback channel subcarrier modulation

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

**Editor's Actions** k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5477**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **326** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.10.4**  
 DVJ174(subclause=8.4.5.4.10.4,page=326,line=10):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5478**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ175(subclause=8.4.5.4.10.4,page=326,line=17): Needs a "(continued)"	Editorial, Satisfied (was	326	17		8.4.5.4.10.4

Suggested Remedy  
Do it.

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation:      Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group      Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Do it.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5479**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **326** Starting Line # **51** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.10.4**  
 DVJ173(subclause=8.4.5.4.10.4,page=326,line=51):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5480**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **327** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.10.4**  
 Table 298d is missing "(continued)" in the title on the second page and the table format (double-ruled lines) doesn't match the other tables.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add "(continued)" and fix the table format.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Add "(continued)" and fix the table format.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This is not a technical comment; this is editorial. The tight schedule for this re-circ does not permit me the luxury of tweaking cosmetic changes to tables. The IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual section 5.4.3.2 (Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes) reads: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5481**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **327** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.10.4**

DVJ176(subclause=8.4.5.4.10.4,page=327,line=5):  
Needs a "(continued)"

Suggested Remedy

Do it.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Do it.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5482**

Comment submitted by: Tal

Kaitz

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	328	Starting Line #	31	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.4.10.5
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

The text on fast DL measurement for enhanced fast-feedback channel contains several inconsistencies:

- 1) equation (107b) describes quantization to 4 bits, which is appropriate for the regular 4-bit fast-feedback channel and not for the enhanced FFB channel (which is the subject of this subsection) . The enhanced FFB include 6 bits of payload.
- 2) equation (107b) and the text preceding it (lines 45-54 on page 328) contradict the text preceding equation (107c) (lines 1-7 on page 329). The two texts instruct different actions for the same scenarios.
- 3) equations (107b) and (107c) instruct the MS to reduce  $10 \cdot \log_{10}(N_r)$  from the post-processing SNR. However:
  - The BS is interested in the post-processing SNR (i.e. SNR at the input to the FEC decoder per layer or average over layers), which includes all gains (including any Rx antenna gains).
  - Further, the BS does not know the number of Rx antennas at the MS (there is no message to instruct this).
  - The number of Rx antennas at the MS may be transparent to the BS, for example when the MS operates an MRRC scheme at the receiver.
- 4) Reference to figure 231c on line 47 is incorrect. The correct figure is missing from the draft.

#### Suggested Remedy

- 1) remove text on page 328, lines 45-65.
- 2) provide correct figure and fix erroneous reference on line 47 of page 328.
- 3) remove all references to "delta" from equation 107c.
- 4) modify text on page 329, lines 14-18, as follows:

~~where  $D=10\log_{10}(N_r)$  for the cases of single transmit antenna BS or 2 and 4 transmit antenna BS using matrix A transmission format and  $D=10\log_{10}(N_r/2)$  for case of 2 and 4 transmit antennas BS using matrix B transmission format.  $N_r$  is the number of receive antennas. S/N is post processing S/N averaged over layers as defined in 8.4.5.4.10.5.~~

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt C802.16e-05/305 with the following changes:

Modify the second paragraph on page 2 of the contribution as indicated:

The BS may allocate one or multiple CQICH channels to the MS in UL\_MAP for the purposes of Fast DL Measurement. If a single CQICH is allocated, MS shall report the average post processing S/N. If more than one CQICH is allocated **with same CINR parameters**, the MS shall report post processing S/N of individual layers in order of layer index.

[Add the eq. number for the two equations]

[(107a) for the first equation, (107b) for the second equation]

[Add the following text just below the first eq. (eq. 107a)  
where B is the positive integer value indicated in the SN Reporting Base IE (see 11.7.27). B shall default to "3" if the SN Reporting Base IE was not included in the REG-RSP.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Superseded**

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

[See comment 5487.](#)

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** ) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5483**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **328**

Starting Line # **33**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.5.4.10.5**

Typo and editorial inconsistency.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change all instances of "FAST-FEEDBACK" and "FAST-FEEFBACK" in this Section to "Fast-feedback"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change all instances of "FAST-FEEDBACK" and "FAST-FEEFBACK" in this Section to "Fast-feedback"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

I did not make this global as the comment was specific to the section.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5484**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	328	Starting Line #	33	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.4.10.5
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------

802.16-2004 defines mechanisms for the MS to feedback measurements of the DL S/N on a fast-feedback channel. This type of fast feedback is termed "CQICH" (channel quality indication). The MS can be requested to send a S/N measurement via several means, including: sending a Fast Feedback subheader, and sending a CQICH Allocation IE in the UL-MAP.

In an 802.16-2004 fast-feedback channel, 4 bits of information are encoded into a single slot; consequently only 16 different S/N values can be sent on a CQICH. In 802.16-2004, the range of S/N that can be reported is -2 to +26 dB in 2 dB steps.

In P802.16e/D8, an enhanced fast-feedback channel is defined that encodes 6 bits into a slot. The draft also defines new mechanisms for requesting the MS to report DL S/N on this enhanced fast-feedback channel (including an "Enhanced CQICH Allocation IE"), and indicates how the S/N value is to be encoded. However there are a number of problems with the draft:

- 1) It is not clearly stated if requesting a report via the (old) CQICH Allocation IE should result in 6-bit S/N feedback, although this seems to be intent.
- 2) The section that specifies the S/N coding (8.4.5.4.10.5) contains a number of errors and ambiguities, in particular,
  - a. It is not clearly stated which encoding formula is supposed to be used in which cases;
  - b. The encoding formulas make use of  $N_r$  (number of MS receive antennas) which is not always known by the BS (for example, if the MS has 2 antennas, but does not support receiving either STC matrix A or B, then there is no way for the MS to indicate the number of its antennas in the "OFDMA SS Demodulator for MIMO Support" IE in SBC).
  - c. Several minor errors, e.g. incorrect cross-references.

These problems could result in the BS mis-interpreting the S/N value reported by an MS, which would have a negative impact on system operation.

In the proposed changes, we clarify the text in 8.4.5.4.10.5. To eliminate the dependency on  $N_r$  in the coding formulas, we introduce an explicit "S/N base" value, which is sent to the MS in the REG-RSP, and used by the MS in the encoding formulas. This allows the BS to insure that the MS's S/N reports cover the numerical range of interest regardless of the antenna configurations. This is a robust approach that will future-proof this important function.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt remedy in IEEE C802.16e-05/289

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded**



Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5487.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    [1\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5485**

Comment submitted by: [Brian](#)

[Johnson](#)

[Member](#)

[2005/06/08](#)

Comment      Type [Technical, Non-binding](#)      Starting Page # **328**      Starting Line # **39**

Fig/Table#      Section **8.4.5.4.10.5**

[Equations 107a and 107b do not appear to match up properly](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Suggest someone review these equations to check if they are correct.](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment 5482.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    [1\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5486**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Non-binding	328	52		8.4.5.4.10.5

*[the text in page 328, line 52- line 65]* is the duplicate of the text in [Cor1/D3 on page 128,line 60 ~ page 129,line 11]

Delete *[the text in page 328, line 52- line 65]*

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete *[the text in page 328, line 52- line 65]* (section 8.4.5.4.10.5)]

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superseded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5482.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5487**

Comment submitted by: Victor

Stolpman

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	---------

Comment #3360, contribution 118r3 was accepted in the D6 recirc, but not reflected in D7 and D8. We have revised 118r3 to 118r4 to reflect the changes in the line number and page numbers from D6 to D8, and to clarify the color coding in 118r3. 118r4 is uploaded.

**Suggested Remedy**

Incorporate accepted 118r3, which has been revised to 118r4 to reflect the Changes in line number and page numbers from D6 to D8, and to clarify the color coding in 118r3.

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**      **Recommendation by**

Adopt Contribution C802.16e-05/310r1.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Adopt Contribution C802.16e-05/310r1.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5488**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **337** Starting Line # **15** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.10.12**  
 DVJ178(subclause=8.4.5.4.10.12,page=337,line=15):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5489**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **337** Starting Line # **45** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.10.12**  
 DVJ177(subclause=8.4.5.4.10.12,page=337,line=45):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5490**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 340 Starting Line # 12 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.5.4.11  
 DVJ180(subclause=8.4.5.4.11,page=340,line=12):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5491**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 340 Starting Line # 44 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.5.4.11  
 DVJ179(subclause=8.4.5.4.11,page=340,line=44):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5492**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **345** Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.5.4.10.5**

editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

*[modify the text in line 10 in page 345 (section 8.4.5.4.10.5) as following ]*

processing ~~S/R~~SNR averaged over layers.

*[modify the text in line 21 in page 405 (section 8.4.5.4.11.1) as following ]*

MS shall report the average post processing ~~S/R~~SNR.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

*[modify the text in line 10 in page 345 (section 8.4.5.4.10.5) as following ]*

processing ~~S/R~~SNR averaged over layers.

*[modify the text in line 21 in page 405 (section 8.4.5.4.11.1) as following ]*

MS shall report the average post processing ~~S/R~~SNR.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5493**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ181(subclause=8.4.5.4.12,page=347,line=33): blank cells.

Starting Page # **347** Starting Line # **33**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.12**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5494**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **347**

Starting Line # **54**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.5.4.15**

**Editorial inconsistency**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Change all instances of "FAST-FEEDBACK" in this Section to "Fast-feedback"**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

**Change all instances of "FAST-FEEDBACK" in this Section to "Fast-feedback"**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**I did not make this global as the comment was specific to the section.**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5495**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **349**

Starting Line # **49**

Fig/Table#

Section **8.4.5.4.15**

Table number is not correct

Suggested Remedy

Change "Table xxx" to "Table 298a"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change "Table xxx" to "Table 298a"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5496**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **350** Starting Line # **26**Fig/Table# **302** Section **8.4.5.4.16**

The description of 'UL\_Permbase' is not for 'UL\_Permbase', but for 'UL\_IDcell'.  
 Note that 'UL\_IDcell' has been replaced with 'UL\_Permbase' in 16e/D8.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the description of 'UL\_Permbase' in table 302b as follows:

-----  
 UL\_Permbase | 7 | ~~CellID~~ **UL\_Permbase** for other BS' sector  
 -----

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Accepted****

Change the description of 'UL\_Permbase' in table 302b as follows:

-----  
 UL\_Permbase | 7 | ~~CellID~~ **UL\_Permbase** for other BS' sector  
 -----

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5497**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **350** Starting Line # **43** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.17**

I object the resolution of comment #4360, which did not fully fix the errors.  
The contents of section 8.4.5.4.17 (Optional Enhanced UL ACK channels) is exactly the same as that of section 8.4.5.4.13 (UL ACK channel).  
Therefore section 8.4.5.4.17 is not needed any more, and the correspondings.

**Suggested Remedy**

[Remedy 1]

Delete section 8.4.5.4.17 (from line 43 page 350 through line 46 page 352)

[Remedy 2] modify the following text in page 373 line 18~19 as:

Each SS should specify support of ~~either~~ "UL ACK" channel, ~~or~~ "Enhanced UL ACK" (see 11.8.3.7.9). ~~A subscriber supporting Enhanced UL ACK shall always transmit Enhanced UL ACK as defined in 8.4.5.4.17.~~

[Remedy 3] modify the following text in page 532 line 9~31 as:

Type	Length	Value	Scope
173	1	bit #0: Reserved; shall be set to zero.	SBC-REQ (see 6.3.2.3.23)
		bit #1: Enhanced FAST_FEEDBACK Under negotiation for SBC fast feedback , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced fast feedback channel in the CQICH allocation IE ( <del>subclause</del> 8.4.5.4.12) <a href="#">and 8.4.5.3.21</a>	SBC-RSP (see 6.3.2.3.24)
		bit #2: UL ACK	
		bit #3: <del>Enhanced UL ACK</del> <a href="#">Reserved; shall be set to zero</a> <del>Under negotiation for UL ACK , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced UL ACK channel.</del>	
		bit #4: UEP fast-feedback	
		bit #5: A measurement report shall be performed on the last DL burst, as described in 8.4.5.4.10.1	
		bit #6: Primary/Secondary FAST_FEEDBACK	
		bit #7: Reserved; shall be set to zero	

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

[Remedy 1]

Delete section 8.4.5.4.17 (from line 43 page 350 through line 46 page 352)

[Remedy 2] modify the following text in page 373 line 18~19 as:

Each SS should specify support of ~~either~~ "UL ACK" channel, ~~or~~ "Enhanced UL ACK" (see 11.8.3.7.9). ~~A subscriber supporting Enhanced UL ACK shall always transmit Enhanced UL ACK as defined in 8.4.5.4.17.~~

~~subscriber supporting Enhanced UL ACK shall always transmit Enhanced UL ACK as defined in 8.4.5.4.17.~~

[Remedy 3] modify the following text in page 532 line 9~31 as:

Type	Length	Value	Scope
173	1	bit #0: Reserved; shall be set to zero. bit #1: Enhanced FAST_FEEDBACK Under negotiation for SBC fast feedback , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced fast feedback channel in the CQICH allocation IE ( <del>subclause</del> 8.4.5.4.12) <a href="#">and 8.4.5.3.21</a> bit #2: UL ACK bit #3: <del>Enhanced UL ACK</del> <a href="#">Reserved; shall be set to zero</a> <del>-Under negotiation for UL ACK , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced UL ACK channel.-</del> bit #4: UEP fast-feedback bit #5: A measurement report shall be performed on the last DL burst, as described in 8.4.5.4.10.1 bit #6: Primary/Secondary FAST_FEEDBACK bit #7: Reserved; shall be set to zero	SBC-REQ (see 6.3.2.3.23) SBC-RSP (see 6.3.2.3.24)

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[Remedy 1]

Delete section 8.4.5.4.17 (from line 43 page 350 through line 46 page 352)

[Remedy 2] modify the following text in page 373 line 18~19 as:

Each SS should specify support of ~~either~~ "UL ACK" channel, ~~or "Enhanced UL ACK"~~ (see 11.8.3.7.9). ~~A subscriber supporting Enhanced UL ACK shall always transmit Enhanced UL ACK as defined in 8.4.5.4.17.~~

[Remedy 3] modify the following text in page 532 line 9~31 as:

Type	Length	Value	Scope
173	1	bit #0: Reserved; shall be set to zero. bit #1: Enhanced FAST_FEEDBACK Under negotiation for SBC fast feedback , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced fast feedback channel in the CQICH allocation IE ( <del>subclause</del> 8.4.5.4.12) <a href="#">and 8.4.5.3.21</a> bit #2: UL ACK bit #3: <del>Enhanced UL ACK</del> <a href="#">Reserved; shall be set to zero</a> <del>-Under negotiation for UL ACK , if enhanced</del>	SBC-REQ (see 6.3.2.3.23) SBC-RSP (see 6.3.2.3.24)

~~-feature is enabled, the SS should use only the  
enhanced UL ACK channel.-~~

bit #4: UEP fast-feedback

bit #5: A measurement report shall be performed on the last  
DL burst, as described in 8.4.5.4.10.1

bit #6: Primary/Secondary FAST\_FEEDBACK

bit #7: Reserved; shall be set to zero

---

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5498**

Comment submitted by: Peiyong

Zhu

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **354** Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **8.4.5.4.20**

The mode mode is applicable till next zone switch IE or the end of frame.

**Suggested Remedy**

The MIMO mode indicated in the MIMO\_UL\_Enhanced\_IE() shall only apply to the subsequent uplink allocation until the end of frame **or the next UL Zone switch IE.**

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Replace text on page 354, line 49:

The MIMO mode indicated in the MIMO\_UL\_Enhanced\_IE() shall only apply to the subsequent uplink allocation until the end of frame.  
with:

The MIMO mode indicated in the MIMO\_UL\_Basic\_IE() shall only apply to the uplink allocation within the IE.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Replace text on page 354, line 49:

The MIMO mode indicated in the MIMO\_UL\_Enhanced\_IE() shall only apply to the subsequent uplink allocation until the end of frame.  
with:

The MIMO mode indicated in the MIMO\_UL\_Basic\_IE() shall only apply to the uplink allocation within the IE.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5499**Comment submitted by: **Peiying****Zhu**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **354** Starting Line # **47**

Fig/Table#

Section **8.4.5.4.20**

Modify the sentence to make it clear

**Suggested Remedy**

In the UL-MAP, a MIMO-enabled BS may transmit ~~UIUC=0, 11, or 15~~ with the MIMO\_UL\_Enhanced\_IE() to indicate the MIMO configuration and pilot patterns of the subsequent uplink allocation to a specific MIMO-enabled MS CID.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

In the UL-MAP, a MIMO-enabled BS may transmit ~~UIUC=0, 11, or 15~~ with the MIMO\_UL\_Enhanced\_IE() to indicate the MIMO configuration and pilot patterns of the subsequent uplink allocation to a specific MIMO-enabled MS CID.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

In the UL-MAP, a MIMO-enabled BS may transmit ~~UIUC=0, 11, or 15~~ with the MIMO\_UL\_Enhanced\_IE() to indicate the MIMO configuration and pilot patterns of the subsequent uplink allocation to a specific MIMO-enabled MS CID.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions **k) done****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5500**

Comment submitted by: Tal

Kaitz

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **357** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.22**

There are several problems with the fast tracking IE:

1) According to the text, fast tracking IE located in UL-MAP of frame k contains corrections for UL allocations transmitted in the UL subframe of frame k-1. This requires the BS to estimate the corrections and encode them into the UL-MAP within a few symbols time at best. This is especially not realistic for UL allocations towards at the end of the UL subframe of frame (k-1). Fast tracking IE transmitted in frame (k) should refer to UL allocations transmitted at frame (k-2).

2) The range of allowed power control corrections in fast tracking IE is too small, while the resolution of frequency correction (0.1% of subcarrier spacing) is too high. These two should be balanced.

**Suggested Remedy**

1) [modify the text on page 357, lines 12-13 as follows]

The UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE in UL-MAP entry is used to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/ corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the frame before the previous frame.

2) [modify the 'power correction' field, page 357 lines 39-44, as follows]

Power correction 2 3 Power correction indication:  
 0b000: no change  
 0b001: +2 dB  
 0b010: -1 dB  
 0b011: -2 dB  
 0b100: -4 dB  
 0b101: -6 dB  
 0b110: +4 dB  
 0b111: +6 dB

2) [modify the 'Frequency correction' field, page 357 lines 45-48, as follows]

Frequency correction 4 3 The correction is ~~0.1%~~ 0.2% of the carrier spacing multiplied by the 4 3-bit number interpreted as a signed integer (i.e. 0b1000: ~~-8~~ -4; ... 0b0000: 0; ... 0b0111: ~~7~~ 3)

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

1) [modify the text on page 357, lines 12-13 as follows]

The UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE in UL-MAP entry is used to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/

The `UL_MAP_Fast_Tracking_IE` in UL-MAP entry is used to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/ corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the frame before the previous frame.

2) [modify the 'power correction' field, page 357 lines 39-44, as follows]

Power correction	<u>2</u> <u>3</u>	Power correction indication: <u>0b000</u> : no change <u>0b001</u> : +2 dB <u>0b010</u> : -1 dB <u>0b011</u> : -2 dB <u>0b100</u> : -4 dB <u>0b101</u> : -6 dB <u>0b110</u> : +4 dB <u>0b111</u> : +6 dB
------------------	-------------------	--

2) [modify the 'Frequency correction' field, page 357 lines 45-48, as follows]

Frequency correction	<u>4</u> <u>3</u>	The correction is 0.1% of the carrier spacing multiplied by the <u>4</u> <u>3</u> -bit number interpreted as a signed integer (i.e. <u>0b1000</u> : <u>-8</u> <u>-4</u> ; ... <u>0b0000</u> : 0; ... <u>0b0111</u> : <u>7</u> <u>3</u> )
----------------------	-------------------	--

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

1) [modify the text on page 357, lines 12-13 as follows]

The `UL_MAP_Fast_Tracking_IE` in UL-MAP entry is used to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/ corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the frame before the previous frame.

2) [modify the 'power correction' field, page 357 lines 39-44, as follows]

Power correction	<u>2</u> <u>3</u>	Power correction indication: <u>0b000</u> : no change <u>0b001</u> : +2 dB <u>0b010</u> : -1 dB <u>0b011</u> : -2 dB <u>0b100</u> : -4 dB <u>0b101</u> : -6 dB <u>0b110</u> : +4 dB <u>0b111</u> : +6 dB
------------------	-------------------	--

2) [modify the 'Frequency correction' field, page 357 lines 45-48, as follows]

Frequency correction	<u>4</u> <u>3</u>	The correction is 0.1% of the carrier spacing multiplied by
----------------------	-------------------	---

the 4-bit number interpreted as a signed integer (i.e. 0b1000: -8; ... 0b0000: 0; ... 0b0111: 7)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

The sentence in the first change is fully changed in comment 5501.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5501**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **357** Starting Line # **15** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.22**  
 Some editorial change about IEs is needed.

**Suggested Remedy**

In Page 275, Line 45, change the paragraph as follows

In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit ~~DIUC=14~~<sup>15</sup> with the MBS\_MAP\_IE() to indicate when the next data for a multicast and broadcast service flow will be transmitted. The offset value is associated with a CID value,

In Page 280, Line 1, change the title as the name of IE

8.4.5.3.15 HO ~~Active Anchor~~ DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

In Page 280, Line 6, change the title as the name of IE

Table 286d - HO ~~Active Anchor~~ DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

In Page 281, Line 3, change the title as the name of IE

8.4.5.3.16 HO ~~CID Translation~~ DL MAP IE ~~in anchor BS~~

In Page 281, Line 6, change the title as the name of IE

Table 286d - HO ~~CID Translation~~ DL MAP IE ~~in anchor BS~~

In Page 357, Line 12, replace the paragraph

~~"The UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE in UL-MAP entry is used to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the previous frame.~~

~~The extended UIUC=15 shall be used for this IE with subcode 0x03."~~

With

"In the UL-MAP, a BS may transmit UIUC=15 with the UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE () to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the previous frame"

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

In Page 275, Line 45, change the paragraph as follows

In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit ~~DIUC=14~~<sup>15</sup> with the MBS\_MAP\_IE() to indicate when the next data for a multicast and broadcast service flow will be transmitted. The offset value is associated with a CID value,

In Page 280, Line 1, change the title as the name of IE

8.4.5.3.15 HO ~~Active Anchor~~ DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

In Page 280, Line 6, change the title as the name of IE

Table 286d - HO ~~Active Anchor~~ DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

In Page 281, Line 3, change the title as the name of IE

8.4.5.3.16 HO ~~CID Translation~~ DL MAP IE ~~in anchor BS~~

In Page 281, Line 6, change the title as the name of IE

Table 286d - HO ~~CID Translation~~ DL MAP IE ~~in anchor BS~~

In Page 357, Line 12, replace the paragraph

~~"The UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE in UL-MAP entry is used to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the previous frame.~~

~~The extended UIUC=15 shall be used for this IE with subcode 0x03."~~

With

"In the UL-MAP, a BS may transmit UIUC=15 with the UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE ()

~~In the UL-MAP, a BS may transmit UIUC=15 with the UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE ()~~  
 to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the frame before the previous frame"

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

In Page 275, Line 45, change the paragraph as follows

In the DL-MAP, a BS may transmit DIUC=145 with the MBS\_MAP\_IE() to indicate when the next data for a multicast and broadcast service flow will be transmitted. The offset value is associated with a CID value,

In Page 280, Line 1, change the title as the name of IE

8.4.5.3.15 HO Active Anchor DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

In Page 280, Line 6, change the title as the name of IE

Table 286d - HO Active Anchor DL MAP IE ~~in non-anchor BS~~

In Page 281, Line 3, change the title as the name of IE

8.4.5.3.16 HO CID Translation ~~DL MAP IE in anchor BS~~

In Page 281, Line 6, change the title as the name of IE

Table 286d - HO CID Translation ~~DL MAP IE in anchor BS~~

In Page 357, Line 12, replace the paragraph

~~"The UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE in UL-MAP entry is used to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the previous frame.~~

~~The extended UIUC=15 shall be used for this IE with subcode 0x03."~~

With

"In the UL-MAP, a BS may transmit UIUC=15 with the UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE ()  
to provide fast power, time and frequency indications/corrections to MS's that have transmitted in the frame before the previous frame"

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5502**

Comment submitted by: Tal

Kaitz

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **357** Starting Line # **15**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.22**

The extended UIUC number for fast tracking IE is 0x07; the text still refers to it as 0x03.

**Suggested Remedy**

modify text on page 357, line 15:

The extended UIUC=15 shall be used for this IE with subcode ~~0x03~~ 0x07

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

modify text on page 357, line 15:

The extended UIUC=15 shall be used for this IE with subcode ~~0x03~~ 0x07

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** ) none needed

Removed by another comment.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5503**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ182(subclause=8.4.5.4.23,page=360,line=2): Title wrong

Starting Page # **360** Starting Line # **2**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.23**

Suggested Remedy  
Include a "(continued)"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Include a "(continued)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5504**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ183(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=362,line=37): blank cells.

Starting Page # **362** Starting Line # **37**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5505**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **363** Starting Line # **31** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**  
 DVJ184(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=363,line=31):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5506**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **364** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**  
 DVJ185(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=364,line=28):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5507**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **365** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**  
 DVJ186(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=365,line=32):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5508**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **366** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**  
 DVJ188(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=366,line=10):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5509**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ187(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=366,line=19): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **366** Starting Line # **19**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5510**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **367** Starting Line # **22** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**  
 DVJ189(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=367,line=22):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5511**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ193(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=368,line=7): Wrong line widths.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	368	7		8.4.5.4.24

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5512**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ190(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=368,line=8): blank cells.

Starting Page # **368** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5513**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ191(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=368,line=31): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **368** Starting Line # **31**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5514**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **368** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**  
 DVJ192(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=368,line=32):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5515**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ194(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=369,line=8): Wrong line widths.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	369	8		8.4.5.4.24

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5516**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **370** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**  
DVJ195(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=370,line=10):  
blank cells.

**Suggested Remedy**

Fill in with dash or text.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5517**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ196(subclause=8.4.5.4.24,page=371,line=7): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **371** Starting Line # **7**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5518**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 371 Starting Line # 48 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.5.4.24.1)  
 DVJ198(subclause=8.4.5.4.24.1,page=371,line=48):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5519**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 371 Starting Line # 53)  
DVJ197(subclause=8.4.5.4.24.1,page=371,line=53):  
blank cells.

Fig/Table# Section 8.4.5.4.24.1

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5520**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **372** Starting Line # **34**  
DVJ199(subclause=8.4.5.4.24.2,page=372,line=34):  
blank cells.

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24.2**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5521**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **372** Starting Line # **34** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.24.2**  
 DVJ200(subclause=8.4.5.4.24.2,page=372,line=34):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5522**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**  
Section refers to wrong Table.

Starting Page # **372** Starting Line # **64**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.25**

**Suggested Remedy**

Change reference as follows:  
"The IE format is shown in Table ~~306w~~302u."

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change reference as follows:  
"The IE format is shown in Table ~~306w~~302u."

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5523**Comment submitted by: **Asaf****Matatyaou**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **373** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# **302u** Section **8.4.5.4.25**

The size of the HARQ ACK Region Allocation IE is 36 bits and is not byte aligned. The length field within the IE requires that the length be indicated in bytes. There is an ambiguity as to what value should be input into the length field.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add a reserved field of 4 bits to byte align the IE:

[Modify table 302u as follows:]

Table 302u - HARQ ACK~~H~~CH region allocation IE

Syntax	Size (bits)	Notes
HARQ_ACKCH_Region_IE ( ) {	-	-
Extended-2 UIUC	4	HARQ_ACKCH_region_IE() = 0x08
Length	8	Length in bytes
OFDMA Symbol offset	8	-
Subchannel offset	7	-
No. OFDMA symbols	5	-
No. subchannels	4	-
<u>Reserved</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Shall be set to zero.</u>
}	-	-

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Fix the title as indicated.

Table 302u - HARQ ACK~~H~~CH region allocation IE**Reason for Recommendation**

It is definded that HARQ-related message or IE should be nibble-aligned. Refer to 58 line on Page 291.

HARQ ACKCH region allocation IE is already nibble-aligned according to the rule.

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Fix the title as indicated.

Table 302u - HARQ ACKCH region allocation IE

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

It is definded that HARQ-related message or IE should be nibble-aligned. Refer to 58 line on Page 291.  
HARQ ACKCH region allocation IE is already nibble-aligned according to the rule.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5524**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ201(subclause=8.4.5.4.28,page=375,line=11): blank cells.**

Starting Page # **375** Starting Line # **11**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.28**

Suggested Remedy  
Fill in with dash or text.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **g) didn't have time**  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5525**Comment submitted by: **Panyuh****Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **377** Starting Line # **17** Fig/Table# **302x** Section **8.4.5.4.29**

I object the implementation of comment#4430.

Editorial: Fast Feedback Polling IE is wrongly referred to extended UIUC instead of extended-2 UIUC.

**Suggested Remedy***[Modify Table 302x (page 377 line 25) as followings:]*

Table 302x - Feedback polling IE format

Syntax	Size(bits)	Notes
Feedback polling IE () {	-	-
Extended-2 UIUC	4	0x0F
...	...	...

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted***[Modify Table 302x (page 377 line 25) as followings:]*

Table 302x - Feedback polling IE format

Syntax	Size(bits)	Notes
Feedback polling IE () {	-	-
Extended-2 UIUC	4	0x0F
...	...	...

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

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5526**

Comment submitted by: [David V.](#)

[James](#)

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type [Editorial, Satisfied \(was](#)

Starting Page # **377**

Starting Line # **24**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.5.4.29**

[DVJ202\(subclause=8.4.5.4.29,page=377,line=24\): blank cells.](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Fill in with dash or text.](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[Fill in with dash or text.](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [g\) didn't have time](#)

[Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5527**

Comment submitted by: Mo-Han

Fong

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **377** Starting Line # **41** Fig/Table# **302x** Section **8.4.5.4.29**

I object to the text change in D8 related the Feedback Polling IE on page 377, because some further bug-fix is required for the Allocation duration field.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Make the following text change on page 377, Table 302x, line 41, column 3]*

The allocation is valid for ~~40~~<sup>4<sup>(d-1)</sup></sup> frame starting from ...

*[Make the following text change on page 378, line 51]*

The allocation is valid for ~~40~~<sup>4<sup>(d-1)</sup></sup> frame starting from ...

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[Make the following text change on page 377, Table 302x, line 41, column 3]*

The allocation is valid for ~~40~~<sup>4<sup>(d-1)</sup></sup> frame starting from ...

*[Make the following text change on page 378, line 51]*

The allocation is valid for ~~40~~<sup>4<sup>(d-1)</sup></sup> frame starting from ...

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[Make the following text change on page 377, Table 302x, line 41, column 3]*

The allocation is valid for ~~40~~<sup>4<sup>(d-1)</sup></sup> frame starting from ...

*[Make the following text change on page 378, line 51]*

The allocation is valid for ~~40~~<sup>4<sup>(d-1)</sup></sup> frame starting from ...

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution:

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: <b>P802.16e/D8</b>	Ballot Number: <b>0001045</b>	Comment Date
Comment # <b>5528</b>	Comment submitted by: <b>Joanne Wilson</b>	Member
		2005/06/08

Comment	Type <b>Technical, Binding</b>	Starting Page # <b>379</b>	Starting Line # <b>42</b>	Fig/Table#	Section <b>8.4.5.8.1</b>
---------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	------------	--------------------------

This comment supercedes my previous comment to make reference to the correct input contribution in the section on "Suggested Remedy". Contribution C802.16e-05/216r1 related to "Reduced Private Maps" was accepted in session #37 but the changes were not correctly incorporated into D8.

Suggested Remedy

Accurately incorporate into the next draft the already adopted the changes that are now shown in contribution C80216e-05\_267r1.pdf.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation: <b>Accepted</b>	Recommendation by
Adopt C80216e-05_267r1.pdf.		

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: <b>Accepted</b>
---------------------	------------------------------------

Adopt C80216e-05\_267r1.pdf.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5529**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **381**

Starting Line # **45**

Fig/Table# **308a**

Section **8.4.5.8.1**

Comment #4283 in last session #37 was accepted. But it is not fully reflected on IEEE802.16e/D8.

**Suggested Remedy**

In table 308a, Change the 'if' parenthesis and 'CRC-162' as follows

<del>if (Permutation = 0b11)</del> <u>If (current zone permutation is AMC, TUSC1 or TUSC2)</u>		<del>For the AMC(2x3 type),</del> <u>TUSC1 and TUSC2 all have triple</u> <u>symbole slot lengths</u>
Subchannel offset		
.....		
.....		
CRC-162		

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

In table 308a, Change the 'if' parenthesis and 'CRC-162' as follows

<del>if (Permutation = 0b11)</del> <u>If (current zone permutation is AMC, TUSC1 or TUSC2)</u>		<del>For the AMC(2x3 type),</del> <u>TUSC1 and TUSC2 all have triple</u> <u>symbole slot lengths</u>
Subchannel offset		
.....		
.....		
CRC-162		

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

[Fixed by other comments.](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5530**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Cellid? Is it IDcell?	Editorial	385	60	table	

**Suggested Remedy**

in the following places, change "Cellid" to "IDcell"

- Page 385, line 4
- Page 386, line 1
- Page 387, line 1
- Page 388, line 1
- Page 389, line 1
- Page 390, line 1
- Page 391, line 1
- Page 392, line 1
- Page 393, line 1
- Page 394, line 1
- Page 395, line 1
- Page 396, line 3
- Page 397, line 1

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: Accepted</b>
----------------------------	------------------------------------

in the following places, change "Cellid" to "IDcell"

- Page 385, line 4
- Page 386, line 1
- Page 387, line 1
- Page 388, line 1
- Page 389, line 1
- Page 390, line 1
- Page 391, line 1
- Page 392, line 1
- Page 393, line 1
- Page 394, line 1
- Page 395, line 1
- Page 396, line 3

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5531**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ204(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=390,line=5): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **390** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Index

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Index

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5532**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ205(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=390,line=5): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **390** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Segment

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Segment

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5533**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ206(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=390,line=5): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **390** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: IDcell

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: IDcell

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5534**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 390 Starting Line # 8 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.6.1.1  
 DVJ203(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=390,line=8):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5535**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ207(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=391,line=5): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **391** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Index

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Index

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5536**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ208(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=391,line=5): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **391** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: IDcell

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: IDcell

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5537**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ209(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=391,line=5): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **391** Starting Line # **5**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Segment

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Segment

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5538**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ210(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=392,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **392** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Index

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Index

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5539**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ211(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=392,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **392** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: IDcell

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: IDcell

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5540**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ212(subclause=8.4.6.1.1,page=392,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **392** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Segment

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Segment

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5541**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ214(subclause=8.4.6.1.1.2,page=399,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

Starting Page # **399** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: PAPR (dB)

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: PAPR (dB)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5542**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ215(subclause=8.4.6.1.1.2,page=399,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **399** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: NFFT

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: NFFT

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5543**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ213(subclause=8.4.6.1.1.2,page=399,line=9): Wrong.**

Starting Page # **399** Starting Line # **9**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.1.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

**FFT- ==> FFT**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

**FFT- ==> FFT**

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

**Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5544**

Comment submitted by: Tal

Kaitz

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	400	Starting Line #	12	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.6.1.2.1.1
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

The 802.16e text (as well as Cor1 text) defines the values of 'IDcell' used for the two equations that define the PUSC permutation (cluster permutation defined in section 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 and 'inner permutation' defined in eq. (111)). For PUSC zones with zone-switch IE indicator 'use all SC=0', the cluster permutation is initialized with IDcell = 0. However for PUSC zones defined with 'use all SC=0', the IDcell value specified in the zone\_switch\_IE is the same one used for both the inner and cluster permutations. .

The coupling between inner and cluster permutations when 'use all SC=1' adds an unneeded restriction on the system design. For zones with 'use all SC=1', separate values should be used for the inner and cluster permutations of PUSC.

Decoupling these values has merit because PUSC permutation hit-ratio properties highly depend on the IDcell value used; hence better optimization of hit-ratio can be achieved by selecting distinct IDcell values for the different components of the permutation

The proposal is to add a DCD TLV that specifies an independent value for the PUSC cluster permutation, overriding the current definition. Backward compatibility since the default operation is left unchanged, and the BS can make sure not to allocate resources to legacy SSS in zones where the default was overridden.

This does not add any complexity to MSS design since it already needs to support all possible IDcell values for both inner and cluster permutation equations in PUSC

**Suggested Remedy**

Apply (inserting an appropriate value for 'XXX'):

[Add the following field to table 358 (DCD channel encodings):]

<u>DL_ClusterPermBase</u>	<u>XXX</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Value used in the clustering renumbering formula described in section 8.4.6.1.2.1.1, for PUSC zones for which the indicator 'use all SC' = 1.</u>	<u>OFDMA</u>
---------------------------	------------	----------	--	--------------

[modify text on page 400, lines 12-15]

LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence( (PhysicalCluster+13\*~~IDcell~~ DL\_ClusterPermBase) mod Nclusters)

In the first PUSC zone of the downlink (first downlink zone), the default used ~~IDcell~~ DL\_ClusterPermBase is 0. When the 'Use all SC indicator=0' in the STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE(), DL\_ClusterPermBase is replaced with 0. For All other cases DL\_ClusterPermBase parameter transmitted in the DCD message shall be used, or, if the parameter was not transmitted in a DCD message, the IDcell parameter in the STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE() shall be used.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

It breaks backward compatibility. A 16d terminal can't decode burst allocated in the PUSC zone built as this comment's suggestion.

DCD message would not be recieved correctly if the first zone can not be decoded (which means first zone should be decoded without any knowledge of the DCD). For partial loading in a Reuse1 scenario one can use the FUSC mode for better results.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5545**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	401	Starting Line #	1	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.6.1.2.1.1
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	---------------

The text in 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 is only correct for downlink PUSC mode with FFT=2048.

The text needs to be rewritten to describe explicitly downlink PUSC modes with FFT size 128, 512, 1024 or 2048

(on behalf of Guillaume LEBRUN)

#### Suggested Remedy

Replace the text in 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 with the following text:

"

#### 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 Downlink subchannels subcarrier allocation in PUSC

[Remove all paragraphs in 8.4.6.2.1.1 and insert the following text:]

The carrier allocation to subchannels is performed using the following procedure:

1) Dividing the subcarriers into Nclusters physical clusters containing 14 adjunct subcarriers each (starting from carrier 0). The number of clusters, Nclusters, varies with FFT sizes. See Tables 310, 310a, 310b and 310c for details.

2) Renumbering the physical clusters into logical clusters using the following formula: LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence( (PhysicalCluster+13\*IDcell) mod Nclusters), where the renumbering sequence, RenumberingSequence, varies with FFT sizes. See Tables 310, 310a, 310b and 310c for details. In the first PUSC zone of the downlink (first downlink zone), the default used IDcell is 0.

3) Allocate logical clusters to groups. The allocation algorithm varies with FFT sizes.

For FFT size=2048:

Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters 0-23, group 1 includes clusters 24-39, group 2 includes clusters 40-63, group 3 includes clusters 64-79, group 4 includes clusters 80-103, group 5 includes clusters 104-119. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it (by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2).

For FFT size=1024:

Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters 0-11, group 1 includes clusters 12-19, group 2 includes clusters 20-31, group 3 includes clusters 32-39, group 4 includes clusters 40-51, group 5 includes clusters 52-59. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it (by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2).

For FFT size=512:

Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters 0-4, group 1 includes clusters 5-9, group 2 includes clusters 10-14, group 3 includes clusters 15-19, group 4 includes clusters 20-24, group 5 includes clusters 25-29. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it (by default group 0 is allocated

to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2).

For FFT size=128:

There is one single group, Group 0. Group 0 includes clusters 0-5.

4) Allocating carriers to subchannel in each major group is performed by first allocating the pilot carriers within each cluster, and then taking all remaining data carriers within the symbol and using the same procedure described in 8.4.6.1.2.2.2. The parameters vary with FFT sizes.

For FFT size=2048:

Use the parameters from Table 310, with PermutationBase12 for even numbered major groups, and PermutationBase8 for odd numbered major groups, to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol.

For FFT size=1024:

Use the parameters from Table 310 a, with PermutationBase6 for even numbered major groups, and PermutationBase4 for odd numbered major groups, to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol.

For FFT size=512:

Use the parameters from Table 310 b to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol.

For FFT size=128:

Use the parameters from Table 310 c to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol.

Note that, for all FFT sizes, IDcell used for the first PUSC zone is 0.

"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**

**Recommendation by**

Replace the text in 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 with the following text:

"

8.4.6.1.2.1.1 Downlink subchannels subcarrier allocation in PUSC

[Remove all paragraphs in 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 and insert the following text:]

The carrier allocation to subchannels is performed using the following procedure:

1) Dividing the subcarriers into Nclusters physical clusters containing 14 adjunct subcarriers each (starting from carrier 0). The number of clusters, Nclusters, varies with FFT sizes. See Tables 310, 310a, 310b and 310c for details.

2) Renumbering the physical clusters into logical clusters using the following formula:

LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence( (PhysicalCluster+13\*IDcell) mod Nclusters), where the renumbering sequence, RenumberingSequence, varies with FFT sizes. See Tables 310, 310a, 310b and 310c for details. In the first PUSC zone of the downlink (first downlink zone), the default used IDcell is 0;

2) Renumbering the physical clusters into logical clusters using the following formula:

LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence( (PhysicalCluster+13\*DL\_PermBase) mod Nclusters)

In the first PUSC zone of the downlink (first downlink zone) the default used DL\_PermBase is 0. When the

in the first PUSC zone of the downlink (first downlink zone), the default value DL\_PermBase is 0. When the 'Use all SC indicator=0' in the STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE(), DL\_PermBase is replaced with 0. For All other cases DL\_PermBase parameter in the STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE() shall be used.

3) Allocate logical clusters to groups. The allocation algorithm varies with FFT sizes.

For FFT size=2048:

Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters 0-23, group 1 includes clusters 24-39, group 2 includes clusters 40-63, group 3 includes clusters 64-79, group 4 includes clusters 80-103, group 5 includes clusters 104-119. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it (by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2).

For FFT size=1024:

Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters 0-11, group 1 includes clusters 12-19, group 2 includes clusters 20-31, group 3 includes clusters 32-39, group 4 includes clusters 40-51, group 5 includes clusters 52-59. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it (by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2).

For FFT size=512:

Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters ~~0-40-9~~, ~~group 1 includes clusters 5-9~~, group 2 includes clusters ~~40-14~~10-19, ~~group 3 includes clusters 15-19~~, group 4 includes clusters ~~20-24~~20-29, ~~group 5 includes clusters 25-29~~. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it (by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2).

For FFT size=128:

~~There is one single group, Group 0. Group 0 includes clusters 0-5.~~

Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters 0-1, group 2 includes clusters 2-3, group 4 includes clusters 4-5. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it (by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2).

4) Allocating subcarriers to subchannel in each major group is performed separately for each OFDMA

symbol by first allocating the pilot carriers within each cluster, and then taking all remaining data carriers within the symbol and using the same procedure described in 8.4.6.1.2.2.2. The parameters vary with FFT sizes.

For FFT size=2048:

Use the parameters from Table 310, with ~~PermutationBase12~~ basic permutation sequence 12 for even numbered major groups, and ~~PermutationBase8~~ basic permutation sequence 8 for odd numbered major groups, to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol.

For FFT size=1024:

Use the parameters from Table 310 a, with ~~PermutationBase6~~ basic permutation sequence 6 for even numbered major groups, and ~~PermutationBase4~~ basic permutation sequence 4 for odd numbered major groups, to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol.

For FFT size=512:

Use the parameters from Table 310 b, with basic permutation sequence 5 for even numbered major groups, to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol.

For FFT size=128:

Use the parameters from Table 310 c to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol.

DL\_PermBase used for the first PUSC zone is the preamble IDcell, otherwise a PUSC zone shall use the DL\_PermBase parameter in the STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE(). The subcarrier indexing within each group shall start from 0, where 0 is the lowest number subcarrier in the lowest numbered



[logical cluster belonging to the group.](#)

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Replace the text in 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 with the following text:

"

#### [8.4.6.1.2.1.1 Downlink subchannels subcarrier allocation in PUSC](#)

[\[Remove all paragraphs in 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 and insert the following text:\]](#)

[The carrier allocation to subchannels is performed using the following procedure:](#)

[1\) Dividing the subcarriers into Nclusters physical clusters containing 14 adjunct subcarriers each \(starting from carrier 0\). The number of clusters, Nclusters, varies with FFT sizes. See Tables 310, 310a, 310b and 310c for details.](#)

[2\) Renumbering the physical clusters into logical clusters using the following formula:  \$LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence\( \(PhysicalCluster + 13 \* ID\_{cell}\) \bmod Nclusters\)\$ , where the renumbering sequence, RenumberingSequence, varies with FFT sizes. See Tables 310, 310a, 310b and 310c for details. In the first PUSC zone of the downlink \(first downlink zone\), the default used  \$ID\_{cell}\$  is 0.](#)

[2\) Renumbering the physical clusters into logical clusters using the following formula:  \$LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence\( \(PhysicalCluster + 13 \* DL\\_PermBase\) \bmod Nclusters\)\$  In the first PUSC zone of the downlink \(first downlink zone\) the default used  \$DL\\_PermBase\$  is 0. When the 'Use all SC indicator=0' in the  \$STC\\_DL\\_Zone\\_IE\(\)\$ ,  \$DL\\_PermBase\$  is replaced with 0. For All other cases  \$DL\\_PermBase\$  parameter in the  \$STC\\_DL\\_Zone\\_IE\(\)\$  shall be used.](#)

[3\) Allocate logical clusters to groups. The allocation algorithm varies with FFT sizes.](#)

[For FFT size=2048:](#)

[Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters 0-23, group 1 includes clusters 24-39, group 2 includes clusters 40-63, group 3 includes clusters 64-79, group 4 includes clusters 80-103, group 5 includes clusters 104-119. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it \(by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2\).](#)

[For FFT size=1024:](#)

[Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters 0-11, group 1 includes clusters 12-19, group 2 includes clusters 20-31, group 3 includes clusters 32-39, group 4 includes clusters 40-51, group 5 includes clusters 52-59. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it \(by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2\).](#)

[For FFT size=512:](#)

[Dividing the clusters into six major groups. Group 0 includes clusters ~~0-4~~0-9, group 1 includes clusters ~~5-9~~, group 2 includes clusters ~~10-14~~10-19, group 3 includes clusters ~~15-19~~, group 4 includes clusters ~~20-24~~20-29, group 5 includes clusters ~~25-29~~. These groups may be allocated to segments, if a](#)

segment is being used, then at least one group shall be allocated to it (by default group 0 is allocated to sector 0, group 2 is allocated to sector 1, and group 4 to is allocated sector 2).

For FFT size=128:

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5546**Comment submitted by: **Lei****Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	401	Starting Line #	12	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.6.1.2.1.1
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

Secion 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 in 802.16e/d8 does not have a clear explanation of DL PUSC operation. Clarification is required.

**Suggested Remedy**Change bullet 2 as follows:

2) Renumbering the physical clusters into logical clusters using the following formula:

LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence( (PhysicalCluster+13\*DL\_PermBase) mod Nclusters)

In the first PUSC zone of the downlink (first downlink zone) the default used DL\_PermBase is 0. When the

'Use all SC indicator=0' in the STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE(), DL\_PermBase is replaced with 0. For All other

cases DL\_PermBase parameter in the STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE() shall be used.

Add the following bullets:

3) Dividing the clusters into 6 major groups as described by Table 268a. Note that this table describes subchannels, where a subchannel consists of 2 downlink PUSC clusters. Therefore, the cluster range in each group is double the subchannel range. For example, for FFT size 1024, group number 3 will have clusters 32-39.

4) Allocating subcarriers to subchannels in each major group is performed separately for each OFDMA

symbol by first allocating the pilot carriers within each cluster, and then taking all remaining data

carriers within the symbol and using the same procedure described in 8.4.6.1.2.2.2 (with the

parameters from Table 310, using the basic permutation sequence appropriate for

each major group, basic permutation sequence 12 (2048 FFT), 6 (1024 FFT) or 5 (512 FFT)

for even numbered major groups, and basic permutation sequence 8 (2048 FFT), 4 (1024 FFT) or none (512 FFT) for odd numbered major

groups) to partition the subcarriers into subchannels containing 24 data subcarriers in each symbol. DL\_PermBase used for the first PUSC zone is

the preamble IDcell, otherwise a PUSC zone

shall use the DL\_PermBase parameter in the STC\_DL\_Zone\_IE(). The subcarrier indexing within

each group shall start from 0, where 0 is the lowest number subcarrier in the lowest numbered

logical cluster belonging to the group.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**See comment 5545

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) [none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5547**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **402** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# **311** Section **8.4.6.1.2.2**

I object the implementation of comment #4286.

The numbers of left/right guard carriers for 512-FFT and 128-FFT for FUSC are inconsistent with other modes.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Modify Table 311b (page 402 line 7) as followings:]*

Table 311b - 512-FFT OFDMA downlink carrier allocations - FUSC

Parameter	Value	Comments
Number of DC Subcarriers	1	Index 256
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Left	<del>42</del> 43	-
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Right	<del>43</del> 42	-
...	...	...

*[Modify Table 311c (page 403 line 11) as followings:]*

Table 311c - 128-FFT OFDMA downlink carrier allocations - FUSC

Parameter	Value	Comments
Number of DC Subcarriers	1	Index 64
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Left	<del>40</del> 11	-
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Right	<del>41</del> 10	-
...	...	...

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[Modify Table 311b (page 402 line 7) as followings:]*

Table 311b - 512-FFT OFDMA downlink carrier allocations - FUSC

Parameter	Value	Comments
-----------	-------	----------

Parameter	Value	Comments
Number of DC Subcarriers	1	Index 256
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Left	<del>42</del> 43	-
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Right	<del>43</del> 42	-
...	...	...

[Modify Table 311c(page 403 line 11) as followings:]

Table 311c - 128-FFT OFDMA downlink carrier allocations - FUSC

Parameter	Value	Comments
Number of DC Subcarriers	1	Index 64
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Left	<del>40</del> 11	-
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Right	<del>41</del> 10	-
...	...	...

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[Modify Table 311b (page 402 line 7) as followings:]

Table 311b - 512-FFT OFDMA downlink carrier allocations - FUSC

Parameter	Value	Comments
Number of DC Subcarriers	1	Index 256
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Left	<del>42</del> 43	-
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Right	<del>43</del> 42	-
...	...	...

[Modify Table 311c(page 403 line 11) as followings:]

Table 311c - 128-FFT OFDMA downlink carrier allocations - FUSC

Parameter	Value	Comments
Number of DC Subcarriers	1	Index 64
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Left	<del>40</del> 11	-
Number of Guard Subcarriers, Right	<del>44</del> 10	-
...	...	...

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5548**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **403** Starting Line # **34** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.2.2.2**

For Downlink PUSC mode, Section 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 (page 564 of 802.16-2004) describes the carrier allocation to subchannels.

However the word "group" is used twice with two different meanings which can be confusing for the reader:

-group is used to define a collection of clusters (8.4.6.1.2.1.1, bullet point 3)

-group defines a collection of X contiguous subcarriers (8.4.6.1.2.2.2 as referred to in 8.4.6.1.2.1.1, bullet point 4).

(on behalf of Guillaume LEBRUN)

#### Suggested Remedy

We propose to replace the word group by the word pool in 8.4.6.1.2.2.2.

Insert the following text at the end of 8.4.6.1.2.2

"

8.4.6.1.2.2.2 Partitioning of data subcarriers into subchannels in downlink FUSC

[Change 8.4.6.1.2.2.2 as follows:]

After mapping all pilots, the remainder of the used subcarriers are used to define the data subchannels.

To allocate the data subchannels, the remaining subcarriers are partitioned into ~~groups~~ pools of contiguous subcarriers. Each subchannel consists of one subcarrier from each of these ~~groups~~ pools. The number of ~~groups~~ pools is therefore equal to the number of subcarriers per subchannel, and it is denoted  $N_{\text{subcarriers}}$ . The number of the subcarriers in a ~~group~~ pool is equal to the number of subchannels, and it is denoted  $N_{\text{subchannels}}$ . The number of data subcarriers is thus equal to  $N_{\text{subcarriers}} \cdot N_{\text{subchannels}}$ .

"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

#### Reason for Recommendation

The comment is good, but it should be done in the 802.16-2004 corrigenda.

Inserting text from 802.16-2004 into 802.16e only to make an editorial change seems to make the standard overall less clear

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

The comment is good, but it should be done in the 802.16-2004 corrigenda.

Inserting text from 802.16-2004 into 802.16e only to make an editorial change seems to make the standard overall less clear



**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) [none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5549**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **403** Starting Line # **57** Fig/Table# **Tabl** Section **8.4.6.1.2.3**

For the Optional FUSC, symbol index is necessary. For the symbol index, preamble, midamble, sounding symbol shall be excluded for counting. It is because that the symbol index shall be counted only for the FUSC symbol only.

**Suggested Remedy**

## 8.4.6.1.2.3 Additional optional Symbol Structure for FUSC

[Modify the table 312a as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,95$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><math>m</math> is incremented only for data symbols, excluding preambles, Sounding symbols, midambles, etc</u>

[Modify the table 312b as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,45$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><math>m</math> is incremented only for data symbols, excluding preambles, Sounding symbols, midambles, etc</u>

[Modify the table 312c as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,9511$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><math>m</math> is incremented only for data symbols, excluding preambles, Sounding symbols, midambles, etc</u>

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified Recommendation by

8.4.6.1.2.3 Additional optional Symbol Structure for FUSC  
[Modify the table 312a as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,95$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols.</a>

[Modify the table 312b as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,45$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols.</a>

[Modify the table 312c as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,9511$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols.</a>

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

8.4.6.1.2.3 Additional optional Symbol Structure for FUSC  
[Modify the table 312a as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier

	for $k=0,1,\dots,95$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols.</a>
--	---	---

[Modify the table 312b as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,45$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols.</a>

[Modify the table 312c as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,95$ <del>11</del> , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols.</a>

Note: A "data symbol" is a symbol in which overlaps with at least one data slot (whether or not data is allocated on that slot).

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5550**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**  
Reference to the wrong paragraph  
(on behalf of Guillaume LEBRUN)

Starting Page # **404** Starting Line # **60**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.2.3.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Change 8.4.6.1.2.3.1 as follows:

8.4.6.1.2.3.1 Downlink subchannels subcarrier allocation

~~[Remove the two paragraphs in 8.4.6.1.2.2.1, and insert the following text:]~~

~~[Remove the two paragraphs in 8.4.6.1.2.3.1, and insert the following text:]~~

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change 8.4.6.1.2.3.1 as follows:

8.4.6.1.2.3.1 Downlink subchannels subcarrier allocation

~~[Remove the two paragraphs in 8.4.6.1.2.2.1, and insert the following text:]~~

~~[Remove the two paragraphs in 8.4.6.1.2.3.1, and insert the following text:]~~

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5551**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **404** Starting Line # **63**Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.2.3.1**

Fix the wrongly referred section number, equation number, and table numbers.

**Suggested Remedy**

[Remedy 1] Page 404, line 63 :

[Remove the two paragraphs in 8.4.6.1.2.23.1, and insert the following text:]

[Remedy 2] Page 405, line 5 : Table 310e313a,

... As shown in Table ~~310e~~313a, Ns is determined by

[Remedy 3] Page 405, line 6, 14, 18 :

... The exact partitioning into subchannels is according to Equation (~~410a~~112), ...

[Remedy 4] Page 405, line 32

... See Table ~~311a~~313a.

[Remedy 5] Page 405, line 36

... See Table ~~311a~~313a.

[Remedy 6] Page 411, line 47

... See Table ~~311a~~313a.

[Remedy 7] Page 411, line 51

... See Table ~~311a~~313a.**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

[Remedy 1] Page 404, line 63 :

[Remove the two paragraphs in 8.4.6.1.2.23.1, and insert the following text:]

[Remedy 2] Page 405, line 5 : Table 310e313a,

... As shown in Table ~~310e~~313a, Ns is determined by

[Remedy 3] Page 405, line 6, 14, 18 :

... The exact partitioning into subchannels is according to Equation (~~410a~~112), ...

[Remedy 4] Page 405, line 32  
... See Table ~~311a~~[313a](#).

[Remedy 5] Page 405, line 36  
... See Table ~~311a~~[313a](#).

[Remedy 6] Page 411, line 47  
... See Table ~~311a~~[313a](#).

[Remedy 7] Page 411, line 51  
... See Table ~~311a~~[313a](#).

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5552**

Comment submitted by: Lei

Wang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **409** Starting Line # **20** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.2.2**  
 Clarification of UL PUSC is needed

**Suggested Remedy****in line 20 on page 409, Add the following section:****8.4.6.2.2 Partitioning of subcarriers into subchannels in the uplink****[change Section 8.4.6.2.2 as follows]**

The usable subcarriers in the allocated frequency band shall be divided into  $N_{\text{tiles}}$  physical tiles as defined in Figure 236 with parameters from Table 314. The allocation of physical tiles to logical tiles in subchannels is performed in the following manner:

1. Logical tiles are mapped to physical tiles in the FFT using Equation (113); for an example refer to 8.4.6.2.3.

$$\text{Tile}(s,n) = N_{\text{subchannels}} * n + (\text{Pt}[(s + n) \bmod N_{\text{subchannels}}] + \text{UL\_PermBase}) \bmod N_{\text{subchannels}} \quad (113)$$

Where

Tile(s,n) is the physical tile index in the FFT with tiles being ordered consecutively from the most negative to the most positive used subcarrier (0 is the starting tile index)  
 n is the logical tile index (0...5) in a subchannel  
 Pt is the tile permutation  
 s is the subchannel number in the range 0... $N_{\text{subchannels}}-1$   
 UL\_PermBase is an integer value in the range 0...69, which is assigned by a management entity  
 Nsubchannels is the number of subchannels for the FFT size given in Tables 314

After mapping the physical tiles in the FFT to logical tiles for each subchannel, the data subcarriers per subchannel are enumerated by the following process:

1. After allocating the pilot carriers within each tile, indexing the data subcarriers within the subchannels is performed starting from the first symbol at the lowest subcarrier from the lowest tile and continuing in an ascending manner through the subcarriers in the same symbol, then going to next symbol at the lowest data subcarrier, and so on. Data subcarriers shall be indexed from 0 to 47.

2. The enumeration of the subcarriers will follow Equation (114). This enumeration permutes the data subcarriers within each subchannel, setting the order to which the mapping of the data onto the data subcarriers within a subchannel shall be performed.

$$\text{Subcarrier}(n,s) = (n + 13*s) \bmod N_{\text{subcarriers}} \quad (114)$$

Where

Subcarrier(n,s) is the permuted subcarrier index corresponding to data subcarrier n is subchannel s



n is a running index 0...47  
 s is the subchannel number.  
 Nsubcarriers is the number of data subcarriers per subchannel.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified Recommendation by  
**in line 20 on page 409, Add the following section:**

#### 8.4.6.2.2 Partitioning of subcarriers into subchannels in the uplink

*[change Section 8.4.6.2.2 as follows]*

The usable subcarriers in the allocated frequency band shall be divided into Ntiles physical tiles as defined in Figure 236 with parameters from Table 314. The allocation of physical tiles to logical tiles in subchannels is performed in the following manner:

1. Logical tiles are mapped to physical tiles in the FFT using Equation (113); for an example refer to 8.4.6.2.3.

$$\text{Tile}(s,n) = \text{Nsubchannels} * n + (\text{Pt}[(s + n) \bmod \text{Nsubchannels}] + \text{UL\_PermBase}) \bmod \text{Nsubchannels} \quad (113)$$

Where

Tile(s,n) is the physical tile index in the FFT with tiles being ordered consecutively from the most negative to the most positive used subcarrier (0 is the starting tile index)  
 n is the logical tile index (0...5) in a subchannel  
 Pt is the tile permutation  
 s is the subchannel number in the range 0...Nsubchannels-1  
 UL\_PermBase is an integer value in the range 0...69, which is assigned by a management entity  
 Nsubchannels is the number of subchannels for the FFT size given in Tables ~~314~~ 314a/314b/314c

After mapping the physical tiles in the FFT to logical tiles for each subchannel, the data subcarriers per subchannel are enumerated by the following process:

1. After allocating the pilot carriers within each tile, indexing the data subcarriers within the subchannels is performed starting from the first symbol at the lowest subcarrier from the lowest tile and continuing in an ascending manner through the subcarriers in the same symbol, then going to next symbol at the lowest data subcarrier, and so on. Data subcarriers shall be indexed from 0 to 47.

2. The enumeration of the subcarriers will follow Equation (114). This enumeration permutes the data subcarriers within each subchannel, setting the order to which the mapping of the data onto the data subcarriers within a subchannel shall be performed.

$$\text{Subcarrier}(n,s) = (n + 13*s) \bmod \text{Nsubcarriers} \quad (114)$$

Where

Subcarrier(n,s) is the permuted subcarrier index corresponding to data subcarrier n is subchannel s  
 n is a running index 0...47

s is the subchannel number.  
 Nsubcarriers is the number of data subcarriers per subchannel.

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

**in line 20 on page 409, Add the following section:**

#### 8.4.6.2.2 Partitioning of subcarriers into subchannels in the uplink

*[change Section 8.4.6.2.2 as follows]*

The usable subcarriers in the allocated frequency band shall be divided into Ntiles physical tiles as defined in Figure 236 with parameters from Table 314. The allocation of physical tiles to logical tiles in subchannels is performed in the following manner:

1. Logical tiles are mapped to physical tiles in the FFT using Equation (113); for an example refer to 8.4.6.2.3.

$$\text{Tile}(s,n) = \text{Nsubchannels} * n + (\text{Pt}[(s + n) \bmod \text{Nsubchannels}] + \text{UL\_PermBase}) \bmod \text{Nsubchannels} \quad (113)$$

Where

Tile(s,n) is the physical tile index in the FFT with tiles being ordered consecutively from the most negative to the most positive used subcarrier (0 is the starting tile index)  
 n is the logical tile index (0...5) in a subchannel  
 Pt is the tile permutation  
 s is the subchannel number in the range 0...Nsubchannels-1  
 UL\_PermBase is an integer value in the range 0...69, which is assigned by a management entity  
 Nsubchannels is the number of subchannels for the FFT size given in Tables ~~314~~ 314a/314b/314c

After mapping the physical tiles in the FFT to logical tiles for each subchannel, the data subcarriers per subchannel are enumerated by the following process:

1. After allocating the pilot carriers within each tile, indexing the data subcarriers within the subchannels is performed starting from the first symbol at the lowest subcarrier from the lowest tile and continuing in an ascending manner through the subcarriers in the same symbol, then going to next symbol at the lowest data subcarrier, and so on. Data subcarriers shall be indexed from 0 to 47.
2. The enumeration of the subcarriers will follow Equation (114). This enumeration permutes the data subcarriers within each subchannel, setting the order to which the mapping of the data onto the data subcarriers within a subchannel shall be performed.

$$\text{Subcarrier}(n,s) = (n + 13*s) \bmod \text{Nsubcarriers} \quad (114)$$

Where

Subcarrier(n,s) is the permuted subcarrier index corresponding to data subcarrier n is subchannel s  
 n is a running index 0...47  
 s is the subchannel number

S is the subchannel number.  
Nsubcarriers is the number of data subcarriers per subchannel.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review:	<b>P802.16e/D8</b>	Ballot Number:	<b>0001045</b>	Comment Date	
Comment #	<b>5553</b>	Comment submitted by:	Herbert Ruck	Member	2005/06/08
Comment	Type <b>Editorial</b>	Starting Page #	<b>412</b>	Starting Line #	<b>1</b>
		Fig/Table#		Section	<b>8.4.6.2.8</b>

Numbering sequence is wrong, in 802.16-2004 there is no section with 8.4.6.2.7.

Suggested Remedy

ReNUMBER section to 8.4.6.2.7 Optional uplink channel sounding in TDD systems

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted** Recommendation by

ReNUMBER section to 8.4.6.2.7 Optional uplink channel sounding in TDD systems

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

ReNUMBER section to 8.4.6.2.7 Optional uplink channel sounding in TDD systems

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5554**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**  
Numbering sequence is wrong

Starting Page # **412** Starting Line # **6**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.2.8.1**

Suggested Remedy  
8.4.6.2.7.1 Channel sounding

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**  
8.4.6.2.7.1 Channel sounding

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
8.4.6.2.7.1 Channel sounding

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5555**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **413** Starting Line # **16** Fig/Table# **316a** Section **8.4.6.2.8.1**

The UL Sounding Commabd IE shall be nibble-aligned. When there is an if-else clause, regardless of whether the 'if' clause or the 'else' clause is executed the resulting Map IE shall be nibble-aligned. When there is a loop, nibble alignment shall be required before the loop starts and inside the loop.

And corrects the editorial mistakes.

**Suggested Remedy**

discuss and adopt the contribution C80216e-05\_268.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superceded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5459.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5556**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**  
Numbering sequence is wrong

Starting Page # **419** Starting Line # **51**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.2.8.2**

Suggested Remedy  
8.4.6.2.7.2 Power assignment

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**  
8.4.6.2.7.2 Power assignment

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
8.4.6.2.7.2 Power assignment

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5557**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **420**

Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.6.2.8.3**

Numbering sequence is wrong

**Suggested Remedy**

8.4.6.2.7.3 Direct transmission of DL channel coefficients

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

8.4.6.2.7.3 Direct transmission of DL channel coefficients

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

8.4.6.2.7.3 Direct transmission of DL channel coefficients

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5558**

Comment submitted by: **Herbert**

**Ruck**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **421**

Starting Line # **57**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.6.2.8.4**

Numbering sequence is wrong

**Suggested Remedy**

8.4.6.2.7.4 Feedback of Received Pilot Coefficients

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

8.4.6.2.7.4 Feedback of Received Pilot Coefficients

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

8.4.6.2.7.4 Feedback of Received Pilot Coefficients

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5559**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **422** Starting Line # **12**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.6.3**

Section 8.4.6.3 and Sction 8.4.6.4 have exactly the same title.

**Suggested Remedy**

find a better title for those two sections.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

8.4.6.4 Optional permutations for ~~AAS and AMC~~ subchannels PUSC

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

8.4.6.4 Optional permutations for ~~AAS and AMC~~ subchannels PUSC

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5560**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **422** Starting Line # **39** Fig/Table# **Tabl** Section **8.4.6.3.1**

For the AMC permutation, symbol index is necessary. For the symbol index, preamble, midamble, sounding symbol shall be excluded for counting. It is because that the symbol index shall be counted only for the Band AMC symbol only. However, safety zone is defined to puncture the existing subcarriers for a specific zone, the presence of the safety zone shall not change the symbol index counting.

**Suggested Remedy**

## 8.4.6.3.1 AMC optional permutation

[Modify the table 317a as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,95$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><math>m</math> is incremented only for data symbols, excluding preambles, <del>safety zones,</del> Sounding symbols, midambles, etc</u>

[Modify the table 317b as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,47$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><math>m</math> is incremented only for data symbols, excluding preambles, <del>safety zones,</del> Sounding symbols, midambles, etc</u>

[Modify the table 317c as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,11$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><math>m</math> is incremented only for data symbols, excluding preambles, <del>safety zones,</del> Sounding symbols, midambles, etc</u>

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**      **Recommendation by**

8.4.6.3.1 AMC optional permutation  
[Modify the table 317a as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,95$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols</a></u>

[Modify the table 317b as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,47$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols</a></u>

[Modify the table 317c as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,11$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <u><a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols</a></u>

Note: A "data symbol" is a symbol in which overlaps with at least one data slot (whether or not data is allocated on that slot).

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

8.4.6.3.1 AMC optional permutation  
[Modify the table 317a as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
------------	-------	----------

Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,95$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols</a>
------------------------	--	---

[Modify the table 317b as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,47$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols</a>

[Modify the table 317c as follows]

Parameters	Value	Comments
Pilot Subcarrier Index	$9k+3m+1$ for $k=0,1,\dots,11$ , and $m=[\text{symbol index}] \bmod 3$	Symbol of index 0 in pilot subcarrier index should be the first symbol of the current zone. <a href="#">m is incremented only for data symbols</a>

Note: A "data symbol" is a symbol in which overlaps with at least one data slot (whether or not data is allocated on that slot).

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

**Editor's Actions** k) done

The change in the tables is already implemented by a previous comment and with the following text:  
"m is incremented only for data symbols, excluding preambles, Safety zones, Sounding symbols, midambles, etc."  
The note was added.

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5561**Comment submitted by: **Jeff****Mandin****Member****2005/06/08****Comment**      **Type** **Technical, Non-binding**      **Starting Page #** **425**      **Starting Line #** **16**      **Fig/Table#**      **Section** **11.13.19.1**

Resolution to Comment 507 (ROHC support) has the following issues:

- there is no description of how the Convergence Sublayer is supposed to classify the SDU ie. what field, what offset, how is it encoded

**Suggested Remedy**[Adopt contribution C80216e-05\\_287](#)**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**[Adopt contribution C80216e-05\\_287](#)**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**[Adopt contribution C80216e-05\\_287](#)**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5562**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	427	Starting Line #	40	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.6.4.1.1.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

DVJ216(subclause=8.4.6.4.1.1.1,page=427,line=40):  
Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5563**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	428	8

Fig/Table#	Section
	8.4.6.4.1.1.1

DVJ217(subclause=8.4.6.4.1.1.1,page=428,line=8):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Clusters

==&gt;

clusters

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Clusters

==&gt;

clusters

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5564**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **432** Starting Line # **33** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.8.3**

DVJ218(subclause=8.4.8.3,page=432,line=33):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Matrix  
==>  
matrix

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Matrix  
==>  
matrix

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5565**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	433	14		8.4.8.3

DVJ223(subclause=8.4.8.3,page=433,line=14):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**  
Horizontal Encoding  
==>  
horizontal encoding

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Horizontal Encoding  
==>  
horizontal encoding

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5566**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **433** Starting Line # **14** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.8.3**

DVJ224(subclause=8.4.8.3,page=433,line=14):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Matrix  
==>  
matrix

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Matrix  
==>  
matrix

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5567**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ221(subclause=8.4.8.3,page=433,line=35): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	433	35		8.4.8.3

**Suggested Remedy**

Matrix

==&gt;

matrix

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Matrix

==&gt;

matrix

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5568**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **433** Starting Line # **35** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.8.3**

DVJ222(subclause=8.4.8.3,page=433,line=35):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Vertical Encoding  
==>  
vertical encoding

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Vertical Encoding  
==>  
vertical encoding

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions g) didn't have time  
Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5569**Comment submitted by: **David V.****James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ219(subclause=8.4.8.3,page=433,line=53): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	433	53		8.4.8.3

**Suggested Remedy**

Matrix

==&gt;

matrix

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Matrix

==&gt;

matrix

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5570**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	433	53		8.4.8.3

DVJ220(subclause=8.4.8.3,page=433,line=53):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Horizontal Encoding

==&gt;

horizontal encoding

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Horizontal Encoding

==&gt;

horizontal encoding

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5571**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	434	Starting Line #	19	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.8.3.1.1
Wrong reference section in text.									

**Suggested Remedy**

*[modify the text in line 19~20 page 434 (section 8.4.8.3.1.1) as following ]*  
 for m=[symbol index], symbol index 0 is the first symbol(except midamble) in which the STC Zone is applied, k is defined in ~~8.4.6.1.2.2.3~~8.4.6.1.2.3.

*[modify the text in line 37~38 page 435 (section 8.4.8.3.1.1) as following ]*  
 for m=[symbol index], symbol index 0 is the first symbol(except midamble) in which the STC Zone is applied, k is defined in ~~8.4.6.1.2.2.3~~8.4.6.1.2.3.

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: Accepted</b>
----------------------------	------------------------------------

*[modify the text in line 19~20 page 434 (section 8.4.8.3.1.1) as following ]*  
 for m=[symbol index], symbol index 0 is the first symbol(except midamble) in which the STC Zone is applied, k is defined in ~~8.4.6.1.2.2.3~~8.4.6.1.2.3.

*[modify the text in line 37~38 page 435 (section 8.4.8.3.1.1) as following ]*  
 for m=[symbol index], symbol index 0 is the first symbol(except midamble) in which the STC Zone is applied, k is defined in ~~8.4.6.1.2.2.3~~8.4.6.1.2.3.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

<b>Editor's Notes</b>	<b>Editor's Actions</b> k) done
-----------------------	---------------------------------

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5572**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **434** Starting Line # **30**

Fig/Table# **251e** Section **8.4.8.3.1.1**

Vague figures

**Suggested Remedy**

p. 434 Fig. 251e,  
p. 435 Fig. 251f, 251g

In order to avoid misunderstanding, please use different patterns for each pilot instead of using different color

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

p. 434 Fig. 251e,  
p. 435 Fig. 251f, 251g

In order to avoid misunderstanding, please use different patterns for each pilot instead of using different color

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Actually, these \*are\* done with patterns. However, 251f could do with a re-work, as the patterns they selected are less than ideal. Defer to next round.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5573**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	<b>Editorial, Satisfied (was</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>8.4.8.3.1.2.1</b>

DVJ229(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=436,line=10):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Optional  
==>  
optional

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Optional  
==>  
optional

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5574**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	436	Starting Line #	10	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.8.3.1.2.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

DVJ230(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=436,line=10):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Permutation

==&gt;

permutation

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Permutation

==&gt;

permutation

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5575**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	436	Starting Line #	26	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.8.3.1.2.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

DVJ226(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=436,line=26):  
 Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.  
 This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

Data Subcarrier  
 ==>  
 Data subcarrier

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Data Subcarrier  
 ==>  
 Data subcarrier

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5576**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	436	Starting Line #	29	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.8.3.1.2.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

DVJ227(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=436,line=29):  
 Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide.  
 This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

Pilot Subcarrier  
 ==>  
 Pilot subcarrier

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: Accepted</b>
----------------------------	------------------------------------

Pilot Subcarrier  
 ==>  
 Pilot subcarrier

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

<b>Editor's Notes</b>	<b>Editor's Actions</b> g) didn't have time
-----------------------	---

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5577**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	436	Starting Line #	31	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.8.3.1.2.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

DVJ228(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=436,line=31):  
 Capitalization within figure callouts should be limited to the first word, as per IEEE Style Guide. This rule always applies, regardless of whether the callout is split into multiple lines.

**Suggested Remedy**

Null Subcarrier  
 ==>  
 Null subcarrier

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Null Subcarrier  
 ==>  
 Null subcarrier

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5578**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ225(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=436,line=46): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	436	46		8.4.8.3.1.2.1

**Suggested Remedy**

Matrix A

==&gt;

matrix A

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Matrix A

==&gt;

matrix A

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5579**

Comment submitted by: **Wen**

**Tong**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **437** Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.8.3.1.2.1**

Clean up on the terms of streams and layers

**Suggested Remedy**

- page 437: line-1, stream --> layer
- page 437: line-8, stream --> layer
- page 438: line-57 stream --> layer
- page 439: line-47 stream --> layer
- page 443: line-42 sub-streams --> layers
- page 444: line-8 stream --> layer
- page 449: line-29 stream --> layer

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Rejected**

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

In closed loop MIMO, "stream" and "layer" are two different concepts.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** ) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5580**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **437** Starting Line # **6**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.8.3.1.2.1**

DVJ232(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=437,line=6):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Vertical Encoding  
==>  
vertical encoding

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Vertical Encoding  
==>  
vertical encoding

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5581**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ231(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=437,line=7): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	437	7		8.4.8.3.1.2.1

**Suggested Remedy**

Horizontal Encoding

==&gt;

horizontal encoding

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Horizontal Encoding

==&gt;

horizontal encoding

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5582**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	437	34		8.4.8.3.1.2.1

DVJ233(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=437,line=34):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Matrix  
==>  
matrix

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Matrix  
==>  
matrix

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5583**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	437	34		8.4.8.3.1.2.1

DVJ234(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.1,page=437,line=34):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Zone  
==>  
zone

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Zone  
==>  
zone

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5584**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ235(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.2,page=438,line=36): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	438	36		8.4.8.3.1.2.2

**Suggested Remedy**

Optional

==&gt;

optional

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Optional

==&gt;

optional

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5585**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	438	Starting Line #	36	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.8.3.1.2.2
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------------

DVJ236(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.2,page=438,line=36):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Permutation

==>

permutation

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Permutation

==>

permutation

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5586**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ237(subclause=8.4.8.3.1.2.2,page=439,line=41): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	439	41		8.4.8.3.1.2.2

**Suggested Remedy**

Packing of Spatial Multiplexed Streams  
 ==>  
 packing of spatial multiplexed streams

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Packing of Spatial Multiplexed Streams  
 ==>  
 packing of spatial multiplexed streams

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5587**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial, Satisfied (was	440	2		8.4.8.3.2

DVJ238(subclause=8.4.8.3.2,page=440,line=2):  
 English words should not be capitalized simply because  
 their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Optional

==&gt;

optional

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Optional

==&gt;

optional

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5588**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	442	Starting Line #	15	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.8.3.4.1
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------------

There is wrong reference about bits of CQICH.  
 The sentence has wrong antenna index so that it cannot be matched with following equation.  
 Therefore, correct the condition for antenna grouping.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[modify the text in line 15~16 page 442 (section 8.4.8.3.4.1) as following]*

When MS reports ~~0b101111~~0b101110 on its CQICH (See 8.4.5.4.10.7), then BS shall group antenna 0 and 1 for the first subcarrier and antenna ~~0 and 21~~ and 2 for the second subcarrier. In matrix form, it shall be read as

*[modify the text in line 28~29 page 442 (section 8.4.8.3.4.1) as following]*

When MS reports 0b101111 on its CQICH (See 8.4.5.4.10.7), then BS shall group antenna 0 and 1 for the first subcarrier and antenna ~~1 and 20~~ and 2 for the second subcarrier. In matrix form, it shall be read as

*[modify the text in line 39~40 page 446 (section 8.4.8.3.5.1) as following]*

When MS reports 0b101110 on its CQICH, then BS shall group antenna 0 and 1 for the first subcarrier and antenna ~~1 and 2~~ and 3 for the second subcarrier. In matrix form, it shall be read as

*[modify the text in line 55~56 page 446 (section 8.4.8.3.5.1) as following]*

When MS reports ~~0b101111~~0b101111 on its CQICH, then BS shall group antenna 0 and 2 for the first subcarrier and antenna 1 and 3 for the second subcarrier. In matrix form, it shall be read as

*[modify the text in line 37~38 page 447 (section 8.4.8.3.5.2) as following]*

When MS reports 0b110001 on its allocated CQICH, then BS shall group antenna 0 and 1 for the first diversity pair and antenna ~~1 and 22~~ and 3 for the second diversity pair. In matrix form, it shall be read as

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

*[modify the text in line 15~16 page 442 (section 8.4.8.3.4.1) as following]*

When MS reports ~~0b101111~~0b101110 on its CQICH (See 8.4.5.4.10.7), then BS shall group antenna 0 and 1 for the first subcarrier and antenna ~~0 and 21~~ and 2 for the second subcarrier. In matrix form, it shall be read as

*[modify the text in line 28~29 page 442 (section 8.4.8.3.4.1) as following]*

When MS reports 0b101111 on its CQICH (See 8.4.5.4.10.7), then BS shall group antenna 0 and 1 for the



first subcarrier and antenna ~~1 and 2~~ 20 and 2 for the second subcarrier. In matrix form, it shall be read as

*[modify the text in line 39~40 page 446 (section 8.4.8.3.5.1 ) as following ]*

When MS reports 0b101110 on its CQICH, then BS shall group antenna 0 and 1 for the first subcarrier and antenna ~~1 and 2~~ 2 and 3 for the second subcarrier. In matrix form, it shall be read as

*[modify the text in line 55~56 page 446 (section 8.4.8.3.5.1 ) as following ]*

When MS reports ~~0b10111~~ 0b101111 on its CQICH, then BS shall group antenna 0 and 2 for the first subcarrier and antenna 1 and 3 for the second subcarrier. In matrix form, it shall be read as

*[modify the text in line 37~38 page 447 (section 8.4.8.3.5.2) as following ]*

When MS reports 0b110001 on its allocated CQICH, then BS shall group antenna 0 and 1 for the first diversity pair and antenna ~~1 and 2~~ 2 and 3 for the second diversity pair. In matrix form, it shall be read as

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5589**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **445** Starting Line # **4** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.8.3.5**

The permuted matrix B is not based on matrix B (line 4, p. 445). Since the matrix B was added last meeting, the matrix B should be modified as suggested remedy. Even though we change the matrix B, The performance would be same.

**Suggested Remedy**

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} s_1 & -s_2^* & s_5 & -s_7^* & -s_6^* \\ s_2 & s_1^* & s_6 & -s_8^* & s_5^* \\ s_3 & -s_4^* & s_7 & s_5^* & -s_8^* \\ s_4 & s_3^* & s_8 & s_6^* & s_7^* \end{bmatrix}$$

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

The Matrix B stay, but permuted matrix B is modified as follow,

$$B1 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B2 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B3 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B4 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B5 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B6 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \end{bmatrix}$$

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

The Matrix B stay, but permuted matrix B is modified as follow,

$$B1 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B2 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B3 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B4 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B5 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B6 = \begin{bmatrix} s1 & -s2^* & s5 & -s7^* \\ s4 & s3^* & s8 & s6^* \\ s3 & -s4^* & s7 & s5^* \\ s2 & s1^* & s6 & -s8^* \end{bmatrix}$$

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**      Ballot Number: **0001045**      Comment Date

Comment # **5590**      Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**      **Joo**      Member      2005/06/08

Comment      Type **Editorial**      Starting Page # **446**      Starting Line # **7**      Fig/Table#      Section **8.4.8.3.5**

**Typo**

**Suggested Remedy**  
 [ replace V to S1\* within Matrix B3 (line 7 page 446 in section 8.4.8.3.5)]

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: Accepted**

[ replace V to S1\* within Matrix B3 (line 7 page 446 in section 8.4.8.3.5)]

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**      1) none needed

I can see this error in the D8 .pdf file, but I can't find the issue in the FrameMaker source. It may have been fixed by another comment.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5591**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 449 Starting Line # 31 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.8.3.5.3  
DVJ239(subclause=8.4.8.3.5.3,page=449,line=31):  
blank cells.

**Suggested Remedy**

Fill in with dash or text.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Fill in with dash or text.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5592**

Comment submitted by: **Lei**

**Wang**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **450**

Starting Line # **27**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.8.3.6**

For Mt, t should be a subscript.

**Suggested Remedy**

Subscript the t, in the following places:

line 27 page 450

line 28 page 450

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Subscript the t, in the following places:

line 27 page 450

line 28 page 450

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5593**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ240(subclause=8.4.8.3.6,page=451,line=28): Wrong symbol.

Starting Page # 451 Starting Line # 28

Fig/Table#

Section

8.4.8.3.6

**Suggested Remedy**

'\*' ==> 'x', using math symbol

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

'\*' ==> 'x', using math symbol

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5594**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ241(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.1,page=457,line=14): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **457** Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.8.5.2.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: ID cell

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: ID cell

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5595**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 459 Starting Line # 10 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.8.5.2.1  
 DVJ242(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.1,page=459,line=10):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5596**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ243(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.1,page=460,line=8): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.

Starting Page # **460** Starting Line # **8**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.8.5.2.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: ID cell

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: ID cell

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5597**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 461 Starting Line # 22 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.8.5.2.1  
 DVJ244(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.1,page=461,line=22):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5598**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	463	Starting Line #	9	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.8.5.2.1
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	-------------

DVJ245(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.1,page=463,line=9):  
Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5599**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ246(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.1,page=465,line=11): Wrong line widths.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	465	11		8.4.8.5.2.1

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**Reason for Recommendation**

<b>Resolution of Group</b>	<b>Decision of Group: Rejected</b>
----------------------------	------------------------------------

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

<b>Editor's Notes</b>	<b>Editor's Actions</b>  ) none needed
-----------------------	--

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5600**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 466 Starting Line # 49 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.8.5.2.2  
 DVJ247(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.2,page=466,line=49):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5601**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 467 Starting Line # 13 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.8.5.2.2  
 DVJ248(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.2,page=467,line=13):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5602**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 468 Starting Line # 40 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.8.5.2.2  
 DVJ249(subclause=8.4.8.5.2.2,page=468,line=40):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5603**

Comment submitted by: David

Castelow

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	470	Starting Line #	33	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.9.1
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	---------

The text  
 [Remove Figure 254; insert Figure 254a:]  
 is incomplete, as the result is text that refers to a Figure that has been deleted.  
 This also looks like a change that is out of scope as it does not provide any compatibility with 802.16-2004.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace the editorial instruction:  
 [Remove Figure 254; insert Figure 254a:]  
 with the following:  
 [At the end of section 8.4.9.1, insert Figure 254a:]

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

802.16e is an amendment to 802.16-2004, so the current editorial instruction is correct.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions 1) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5604**

Comment submitted by: **Rajesh**

**Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **473**

Starting Line # **16**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.9.2.5.1**

The existing CINR measurement is inadequate in frequency selective channels.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt the resolution in IEEE C802.16e-05/303.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

**Incomplete.**

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5605**Comment submitted by: **Rajesh****Bhalla**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **473** Starting Line # **16**Fig/Table# Section **8.4.9.2.5.1**

The existing H-matrix in the optional LDPC is non-uniform for all the code rates and types.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the remedies in IEEE C802.16e-05/126r1.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt Remedy #2 from Contribution C802.16e-05/288r1.

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Adopt Remedy #2 from Contribution C802.16e-05/288r1.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

Changes are complete with the following exception:

Remedy 2 contains:

In the page 477 of P802.16e/D8, there is a sentence below formula (129i) as following:

"Define (equation) and with the parity check matrix as indicated (equation) or a cycle shift matrix."

In D8, this does not exist as written. In D9, this text has been moved to Annex G, so it'll be harder to locate, but the fact remains that I'm unable to make this change because the contribution is incorrect.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5606**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **475** Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.9.2.5.2**

It is not proper to mark a subclause as informative (see 2005 IEEE Style Guide).

**Suggested Remedy**

[Move this text to an informative Annex.](#)

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

[Move this text to an Informative Annex "LDPC Direct Encoding".](#)

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted**

[Move this text to an Informative Annex "LDPC Direct Encoding".](#)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5607**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 480 Starting Line # 26 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.9.2.5.4  
 DVJ250(subclause=8.4.9.2.5.4,page=480,line=26):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5608**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **482** Starting Line # **30**

Fig/Table#

Section

**8.4.9.5.1**

[Remove "\[](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Remove "\[](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[Remove "\[](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5609**

Comment submitted by: Jaehee

Cho

Other

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	484	Starting Line #	16	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.10.3.2
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

There are errors in the power control section.

1. In current specification, SS does not know BS's Rx antenna gain. So the UL path loss that SS estimates can't include the value. However, the current text says to exclude SS's Rx antenna gain. It was wrongly implemented against the original contribution saying to exclude the BS's Rx antenna gain.
2. Offset\_BSperSS can be sent to SS using some MAC messages and MAP IEs. One of them is UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE(8.4.5.4.22) . In the text, OFDMA Fast Ranging IE(8.4.5.4.21) is mentioned instead of UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE(8.4.5.4.22).
3. UL Tx power can be sent various MAC subheader and messages. In the last session, the section numbers for the subheader and messages were changed. So the wrong references are mentioned in the current spec..
4. For the triggers of UL Tx power reporting, one has to calculate the average value of the path loss. The averaging equation includes error.

#### Suggested Remedy

##### 8.4.10.3.2 Optional open loop power control

**[Modify the text as follows on page 484 line 16]**

L is the estimated average current UL propagation loss. It shall include SS Tx antenna gain and path loss, but exclude the ~~SS~~BS Rx antenna gain.

**[Modify the text as follows on page 485 line 1]**

Additionally, the BS controls the Offset\_BSperSS using PMC\_RSP message (6.3.2.3.58) to override the Offset\_BSperSS value, or using RNG-RSP(6.3.2.3.6), Fast Power Control(FPC) message (6.3.2.3.34), Power Control IE (8.4.5.4.5) and ~~OFDMA-Fast Ranging IE(8.4.5.4.21)~~ UL\_MAP\_Fast\_Tracking\_IE(8.4.5.4.22) to adjust the Offset\_BSperSS value. The accumulated power control value shall be used for Offset\_BSperSS

##### 8.4.10.3.2.1 UL Tx power and Headroom transmission condition

**[Modify the text as follows on page 486 line 3]**

SS may report its transmission power status using Bandwidth request and ~~downlink-burst-profile-change request~~ UL Tx power report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.2), PHY channel report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.53) or UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader (6.3.2.2.7.65). Further, when the following conditions are met, SS may send its transmission power status using Bandwidth request and ~~downlink-burst-profile-change request~~ UL Tx power report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.2), PHY channel report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.53) or UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader(6.3.2.2.7.65).

**[Modify the text as follows on page 486 line 23]**

$M_{avg}(n) = 10 \log(ap_{avg} * 10^{(M(n)/10)} + (1 - ap_{avg}) * 10^{(M(n-1)/10)})$

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

##### 8.4.10.3.2 Optional open loop power control

**[Modify the text as follows on page 484 line 42]**

L is the estimated average current UL propagation loss. It shall include SS or MS Tx antenna gain

L is the estimated average current UL propagation loss. It shall include SS or MS Tx antenna gain and path loss, but exclude the ~~SSBS~~ Rx antenna gain.

#### [Modify the text as follows on page 485 line 1]

Additionally, the BS controls the Offset\_BSperSS using PMC\_RSP message (6.3.2.3.58) to override the Offset\_BSperSS value, or using RNG-RSP(6.3.2.3.6), Fast Power Control(FPC) message (6.3.2.3.34), Power Control IE (8.4.5.4.5) and ~~OFDMA-Fast Ranging IE(8.4.5.4.21)~~ UL\_MAP Fast Tracking IE(8.4.5.4.22) to adjust the Offset\_BSperSS value. The accumulated power control value shall be used for Offset\_BSperSS

#### 8.4.10.3.2.1 UL Tx power and Headroom transmission condition

##### [Modify the text as follows on page 486 line 3]

SS may report its transmission power status using Bandwidth request and ~~downlink-burst-profile-change request~~ UL Tx power report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.2), PHY channel report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.53) or UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader (6.3.2.2.7.65). Further, when the following conditions are met, SS may send its transmission power status using Bandwidth request and ~~downlink-burst-profile-change request~~ UL Tx power report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.2), PHY channel report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.53) or UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader(6.3.2.2.7.65).

##### [Modify the text as follows on page 486 line 23]

$Mavg(n)=10\log(ap\_avg*10^{(M(n)/10)}+(1-ap\_avg)*10^{(M(n-1)/10)})$

##### [Modify the text as follows on page 486 line 11]

$|Mavg(nlast)-Mavg(n)| \geq Tx\_Power\_Report\_Threshold$  (dB) (138d)

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

#### 8.4.10.3.2 Optional open loop power control

##### [Modify the text as follows on page 484 line 42]

L is the estimated average current UL propagation loss. It shall include SS or MS Tx antenna gain and path loss, but exclude the ~~SSBS~~ Rx antenna gain.

##### [Modify the text as follows on page 485 line 1]

Additionally, the BS controls the Offset\_BSperSS using PMC\_RSP message (6.3.2.3.58) to override the Offset\_BSperSS value, or using RNG-RSP(6.3.2.3.6), Fast Power Control(FPC) message (6.3.2.3.34), Power Control IE (8.4.5.4.5) and ~~OFDMA-Fast Ranging IE(8.4.5.4.21)~~ UL\_MAP Fast Tracking IE(8.4.5.4.22) to adjust the Offset\_BSperSS value. The accumulated power control value shall be used for Offset\_BSperSS

#### 8.4.10.3.2.1 UL Tx power and Headroom transmission condition

##### [Modify the text as follows on page 486 line 3]

SS may report its transmission power status using Bandwidth request and ~~downlink-burst-profile-change request~~ UL Tx power report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.2), PHY channel report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.53) or UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader (6.3.2.2.7.65). Further, when the following conditions are met, SS may send its transmission power status using Bandwidth request and ~~downlink-burst-profile-change request~~ UL Tx power report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.2), PHY channel report header (6.3.2.1.2.1.53) or UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader(6.3.2.2.7.65).

##### [Modify the text as follows on page 486 line 23]

$Mavg(n)=10\log(ap\_avg*10^{(M(n)/10)}+(1-ap\_avg)*10^{(M(n-1)/10)})$



[Modify the text as follows on page 486 line 11]

[ $\text{Mavg}(n_{\text{last}}) - \text{Mavg}(n) \geq \text{Tx\_Power\_Report\_Threshold}$  (dB)

(138d)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5610**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **484** Starting Line # **35** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.10.3.2**

The P802.16e draft contains an optional mechanism for open-loop power control. Unfortunately the defining formula causes the MS to reduce its transmit power by  $10\log(R)$ , where R is number of repetitions. This defeats the purpose of using repetitions since the received energy per bit would remain constant independent of the number of repeats.

**Suggested Remedy**

[on p. 484, change eq. 138a on line 35, and delete line 47, as indicated]

$$P(\text{ dBm}) = L - C/N + NI - 10\log_{10}(R) + \text{Offset\_SSperSS} + \text{Offset\_BSperSS}$$

where,

P is the TX Power level (dBm) per a subcarrier for the current transmission, including MS Tx antenna gain.

L is the estimated average current UL propagation loss. It shall include SS Tx antenna gain and path loss, but exclude the SS Rx antenna gain.

C/N is the normalized C/N of the modulation/FEC rate for the current transmission, as appearing in Table 334. Table 334 can be modified by UCD (Normalized C/N override).

~~R is the number of repetitions for the modulation/FEC rate.~~

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Withdrawn**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Withdrawn**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5611**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **487** Starting Line # **47** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.13.1.3**

I object to the resolution of 4443. The issues raised with the resolution approved in P802.16e/D7 as a response to Comment #3473 were not corrected. The prior resolution did not address requirements for measurement and trigger mechanisms needed to support mobile handoffs and did not provide required fields within the appropriate MAC messages for these procedures. The prior resolution also neglected to establish requirements for scanning of specific BS candidates to which handoff would be preferred within the complete neighbor BS set.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt C80216e-05/219r1 which specifies measurements and triggers obtained from the PHY during neighbor BS scanning mechanisms, and modifies existing messages of the MAC, to define appropriate requirements in support of mobile handoff procedures.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt C80216e-05/219r2

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Adopt C80216e-05/219r2

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

"11.8.3.7.17 Association type support" had already been inserted by another comment. What's in there now is a best-guess of a combination of the two different versions of this text.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5612**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **488** Starting Line # **9**

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.15.1**

DVJ251(subclause=8.4.15.1,page=488,line=9):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

Support  
==>  
support

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Support  
==>  
support

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5613**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 497 Starting Line # 10 Fig/Table# Section 11.1.2

I object to the resolution of the comment that added a line to 11.1.2 (sorry, I found the change in the D8delta document but could not find the originating comment).

The line can reasonably be read to specify that an authentication tuple must be the last item in ALL MAC management messages. Because of Table 347 & 348a, this is obviously not the intention.

The line should be clarified.

#### Suggested Remedy

*[In 11.1.2 Authentication Tuples, page 497, line 15, modify as:]*

'An authentication tuple shall be the last item in **identified** management messages.'

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[In 11.1.2 Authentication Tuples, page 497, line 15, modify as:]*

'An authentication tuple shall be the last item in **identified** management messages.'

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[In 11.1.2 Authentication Tuples, page 497, line 15, modify as:]*

'An authentication tuple shall be the last item in **identified** management messages.'

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5614**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Starting Page # 497 Starting Line # 10 Fig/Table# Section 11.1.2

From IETF review:

The IEEE 802.16e 3-way handshake is not replay protected in one of the HMAC variants.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert a new field above the last line in the table 348d as follows:

HMAC Packet Number Counter | 32 | replay counter  
HMAC\_PN\_\*

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**

**Recommendation by**

*Insert a new field above the last line in the table 348d as follows:*

HMAC Packet Number Counter | 32 | replay counter  
HMAC\_PN\_\*

*In section 7.5.3 Calculation of HMAC-Digests add the following marked text*

The digest shall be calculated over the entire MAC Management message with the exception of the HMAC-Digest and HMAC Tuple attributes. In the case of PKMv2 HMAC-Digest Calculations shall include the HMAC\_PN\_\* that should be concatenated after the MAC Management message.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*In Tables 348a and 348c, add to the Scope column:  
"PKM-REQ, PKM-RSP"*

*Insert a new field above the last line (above Short-HMAC-Digest entry) in the table 348d as follows:*

-----  
HMAC Packet Number Counter | 32 | replay counter  
HMAC\_PN\_\*  
-----

*In section 7.5.3 Calculation of HMAC-Digests add the following marked text*

*In section 7.5.3 Calculation of HMAC Digests add the following marked text*

The digest shall be calculated over the entire MAC Management message with the exception of the HMAC-Digest and HMAC Tuple attributes. In the case of PKMv2 HMAC-Digest Calculations shall include the HMAC\_PN \* that should be concatenated after the MAC Management message.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

Note that the last sentence of section 7.5.3 (which is changed in this comment) was already replaced by a different sentence. I just added the marked sentence as an additional text.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5615**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 497 Starting Line # 27 Fig/Table# Table Section 11.1.2.1

I object to the resolution of the comment that restructured 11.1.2.1 included messages (sorry, I found the change in the D8delta document but could not find the originating comment).

Overlooked DREG-REQ. Need to have DREG-REQ since an attacker could simulate a request for a state change. Without the authentication tuple, the BS would have no way to know that the state change request did not come from the valid MS.

Add DREG-CMD to the list of messages in 'Scope' in the Table.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[In 11.1.2.1 HMAC Tuple, page 497, Table 347 and page 498, Table 348a, modify by adding DREG-CMD to the list of messages in 'Scope' in the Tables:]*

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[In 11.1.2.1 HMAC Tuple, page 497, Table 347 and page 498, Table 348a, modify by adding DREG-CMD to the list of messages in 'Scope' in the Tables:]*

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

*[In 11.1.2.1 HMAC Tuple, page 497, Table 347 and page 498, Table 348a, modify by adding DREG-CMD to the list of messages in 'Scope' in the Tables:]*

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions e) editor disagrees

*DREG-CMD* exists in the 'Scope' of both tables.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5616**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **497** Starting Line # **56** Fig/Table# Section **11.1.2.2**

All notes are informative, but the proper way to use them is with "NOTE:" and the correct style in Framemaker.

**Suggested Remedy**

Check the 2005 IEEE Style Guide for instructions or call me and I will walk you through it.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change:

"Informative note: It would..."

To:

"NOTE: It would..."

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change:

"Informative note: It would..."

To:

"NOTE: It would..."

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

This comment (and many other comments with a similar theme) can hardly be considered "technical". Perhaps the group could create a manual or guide similar to the IEEE Style Guide, clearly defining what constitutes a technical, editorial, and a trivial comment.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5617**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **498** Starting Line # **24** Fig/Table# Section **11.1.2.2**  
 DVJ252(subclause=11.1.2.2,page=498,line=24):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5618**

Comment submitted by: **Peiyong**

**Zhu**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **498** Starting Line # **51**

Fig/Table# **348c** Section **11.1.2.3**

Question mark in the table should be replaced by a value, similarly on page 523, 524, 525

**Suggested Remedy**

Assign a value

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Assign values to TLVs on pages: 498, 523, 524, 525.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Assign values to TLVs on pages: 498, 523, 524, 525.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5619**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **501** Starting Line # **34** Fig/Table# Section **11.3.1**  
DVJ253(subclause=11.3.1,page=501,line=34):  
Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5620**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **504** Starting Line # **46** Fig/Table# Section **11.3.1**  
 DVJ254(subclause=11.3.1,page=504,line=46):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5621**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **505** Starting Line # **11** Fig/Table# Section **11.3.1.1**)  
 DVJ255(subclause=11.3.1.1,page=505,line=11):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5622**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **505** Starting Line # **25** Fig/Table# **357** Section **11.3.1.1**

"QPSK (CTC) 2/3" does not exist and was already removed from the corrigendum. Should be changed to be aligned with corrigendum.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text in table 357, line 25 as follows:

"14=~~QPSK (CTC) 2/3~~reserved"

Similarly, change table 363, line 24 as follows:

"14=~~QPSK (CTC) 2/3~~reserved"

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Change text in table 357, line 25 as follows:

"14=~~QPSK (CTC) 2/3~~reserved"

Similarly, change table 363, line 24 as follows:

"14=~~QPSK (CTC) 2/3~~reserved"

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text in table 357, line 25 as follows:

"14=~~QPSK (CTC) 2/3~~reserved"

Similarly, change table 363, line 24 as follows:

"14=~~QPSK (CTC) 2/3~~reserved"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5623**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **506** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **11.3.3**

I object to the resolution of the comment that relocated 11.3.3 Mobility support capabilities (sorry, I found the change in the D8delta document but could not find the originating comment).

I don't know where this is supposed to go, but not under UCD channel messages; probably someplace in 11.7 REG-REQ/RSP management message encodings. But we already have 11.7.13 Mobility parameters support, which would seem to do the same thing.

**Suggested Remedy**

*[Move 11.3.3 Mobility support capabilities to the right section in 11; or delete it]*

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Delete subclause 11.3.3.

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Delete subclause 11.3.3.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5624**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **507** Starting Line # **36** Fig/Table# Section **11.4.1**  
 DVJ256(subclause=11.4.1,page=507,line=36):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5625**

Comment submitted by: Brian

Johnson

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **508** Starting Line # **4** Fig/Table# **358a** Section **11.4.1**

The PHY Mode ID TLV channel encoding in the DCD message is redundant and unnecessary. The information contained in this message needs to be known in order to decode the message anyway. And none of these parameters are intended to be dynamically changed by the network, so there is no reason to include them in the DCD message.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove the table on page 508 lines 46 through 51, the PHY Mode ID TLV encoding. Also remove the entire table 358a on page 508 lines 4 to 33.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

*[In 11.4.1 DCD channel encodings, page 508, Table 358a and two sub-tables after, lines 5-52, move tables to 11.19.1 and replace Table 384; renumber as Table 384]*

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

*[In 11.4.1 DCD channel encodings, page 508, Table 358a and two sub-tables after, lines 5-52, move tables to 11.19.1 and replace Table 384; renumber as Table 384]*

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5626**

Comment submitted by: Kyungjoo

Suh

Other

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	510	Starting Line #	51	Fig/Table#	Tabl	Section	11.5, 11.6
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	------	---------	------------

Even though the current specification supports a number of MCS modulation level, the RNG-RREQ and RNG-RSP message contain only DIUC. Therefore, when SS perform handover or initial ranging at the cell edge, there is no way for SS to communicate BS using a certain MCS level. In this Draft, we offer a solution to overcome this problem including the Repetition Coding Indication.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/298.

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt Contribution C802.16e-05/234r5.

*[Change the sentence indicated from the first paragraph as shown:]*Table 301a defines the format of the Downlink\_Burst\_Profile with type=153, which is used in the DCD message (6.3.2.3.1) for MS only.*[Change the sentence indicated from the second paragraph as shown:]*Table 302a defines the format of the Uplink\_Burst\_Profile with type=13, which is used in the UCD message (6.3.2.3.3) for MS only.*[Add the following sentence directly after the pink paragraph:]*

MAP IEs that do not contain a CID or that contain broadcast/multicast CIDs shall always use Type 1 DIUC (see Table 301).

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Adopt Contribution C802.16e-05/234r5.

*[Change the sentence indicated from the first paragraph as shown:]*Table 301a defines the format of the Downlink\_Burst\_Profile with type=153, which is used in the DCD message (6.3.2.3.1) for MS only.*[Change the sentence indicated from the second paragraph as shown:]*Table 302a defines the format of the Uplink\_Burst\_Profile with type=13, which is used in the UCD message (6.3.2.3.3) for MS only.*[Add the following sentence directly after the pink paragraph:]*

MAP IEs that do not contain a CID or that contain broadcast/multicast CIDs shall always use Type 1 DIUC (see Table 301).

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**      Ballot Number: **0001045**      Comment Date

Comment # **5627**      Comment submitted by: Mark      Cudak      Member      2005/06/08

Comment      Type **Technical, Non-binding**      Starting Page # **512**      Starting Line # **1**      Fig/Table#      Section **11.6**  
Shouldn't change the section name. The section already exists in the base standard and the newly mentioned title and implied scope doesn't cover the whole section.

Suggested Remedy

Change title back to original: "RNG-RSP management message encodings".  
Optionally include a new subsection "11.6.1 RNG-RSP TLVs for establishment of service flows"

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**      Recommendation by

Change title back to original: "RNG-RSP management message encodings".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group      Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change title back to original: "RNG-RSP management message encodings".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5628**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **513** Starting Line # **16** Fig/Table# **367** Section **11.6**

The HO Process Optimization TLV defined for RNG-RSP messages in section 11.6 contains three indications defined only for managed MSs: bit #3, #4, and #5. So the bit #3 - omit network address acquisition management messages during current reentry processing - does not give any valid meaning to unmanaged MSs.

When there is a need for a managed MS to refresh its IP address, the BS can send the MS a RNG-RSP message with the HO Process Optimization bit #3 clear. Similarly, an unmanaged MS performing a handover to a target BS may have to change its IP address due to subnet change between its serving BS and the target BS. The target BS can detect the fact that IP address refresh is required, but there is no way for the BS to let the MS know that. A simple way to solve that problem is to define an indication mechanism to trigger layer 3 protocol exchanges to retain IP connectivity as we do for managed MSs.

One possible way is to reuse the bit #3 of the HO Process Optimization TLV. By changing the meaning of the bit especially for unmanaged MSs, we can achieve our goal by incurring minimum impact on the current specification.

Another way is to use one bit for that purpose among the reserved bits in the HO Process Optimization TLV.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remedy 1 - Change the description of the value field for bit #3 of HO Process Optimization TLV as following:

Bit #3 : Omit Network Address Acquisition management messages during current reentry processing. For an MS not supporting the secondary management connection, omit triggering layer 3 protocol exchanges for refreshing IP address during this HO.

Remedy 2 - Change the line 44 as following:

Bit #12 : Omit triggering layer 3 protocol exchanges for refreshing its IP address during this HO. This bit is valid only for an MS not supporting the secondary management connection.

Bit #123~15 : reserved

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation**

Comment tries to address IP address adquisition at traffic connection which is out of scope of 802.16.

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Comment tries to address IP address adquisition at traffic connection which is out of scope of 802.16.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5629**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Non-binding	513	40		

The following text is unclear:

-----  
 Bit #11 : BS can use SN\_REPORT, if sent by MS upon HO completion, for continuation of SDU SN or ARQ enabled connections  
 -----

This TLV may be used by BS [in RNG-RSP], so what does it mean that "BS can use SN\_REPORT" [SN Report Header?]. It always can.

## Suggested Remedy

Either clarify or move the bit to reserved

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by

Bit#11: (Target) BS supports virtual SDU SN.

If bit#11=1 and MS supports virtual SDU SN, it shall issue SN\_REPORT upon completion of HO to this BS.

## Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Bit#11: (Target) BS supports virtual SDU SN.

If bit#11=1 and MS supports virtual SDU SN, it shall issue SN\_REPORT upon completion of HO to this BS.

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5630**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 514 Starting Line # 7 Fig/Table# Section 11.6  
 DVJ257(subclause=11.6,page=514,line=7):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5631**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **515** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **11.6**  
The Next Periodic Ranging description is included twice in this section. The second definition does not belong in this section; it should be (and is) in the sleep section 11.17.2

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove the whole entry as shown:

"

---

<del>Name</del>	<del>Type</del>	<del>Length</del>	<del>Value</del>
<del>Next Periodic Ranging</del>	<del>21</del>	<del>2</del>	<del>This value indicates offset of the frame in which the periodic ranging will be performed with respect to the frame where MOB_SLP-RSP is transmitted. If MS receives MOB_SLP-RSP message with 'Next Periodic Ranging' = 0, it shall deactivate all active Power Saving Classes and return to Normal Operation."</del>

"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Remove the whole entry as shown:

"

---

<del>Name</del>	<del>Type</del>	<del>Length</del>	<del>Value</del>
<del>Next Periodic Ranging</del>	<del>21</del>	<del>2</del>	<del>This value indicates offset of the frame in which the periodic ranging will be performed with respect to the frame where MOB_SLP-RSP is transmitted. If MS receives MOB_SLP-RSP message with 'Next Periodic Ranging' = 0, it shall deactivate all active Power Saving Classes and return to Normal Operation."</del>

"

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Remove the whole entry as shown:

"

---

<del>Name</del>	<del>Type</del>	<del>Length</del>	<del>Value</del>
-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	------------------



<del>Next Periodic Ranging</del>	<del>21</del>	<del>2</del>	<del>This value indicates offset of the frame in which the periodic ranging will be performed with respect to the frame where MOB_SLP-RSP is transmitted. If MS receives MOB_SLP-RSP message with 'Next Periodic Ranging' = 0, it shall deactivate all active Power Saving Classes and return to Normal Operation."</del>
----------------------------------	---------------	--------------	---

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    [1\) none needed](#)

[Appears to have been cleaned up by another comment.](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5632**

Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon**

**Kim**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **515**

Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table#

Section **11.6**

**Next Periodic Ranging TLV is duplicate.**

**Suggested Remedy**

**Remove the Next Periodic Ranging TLV from the page 515.**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superceded****

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

**See comment 5631.**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5633**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **515** Starting Line # **15**Fig/Table# Section **11.7**

Many TLV-description-tables in Section 11.7 do not provide a proper scope.

**Suggested Remedy**

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-REQ/REG-RSP" in the following Table:  
 \* Section 11.7.10 Method for allocating IP address for the secondary management connection

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-REQ" in the following Table:  
 \* Section 11.7.14 Sleep-mode recovery time

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-RSP" in the following Tables:  
 \* Section 11.7.8.9 Compressed CID update encodings  
 \* Section 11.7.9 CID update encodings, in first Table ("CID\_Update")  
 \* Section 11.7.18 SAID update encodings, in first Table ("SAID update")  
 \* Section 11.7.19 Total number of provisioned service flow  
 \* Section 11.7.21 SA TEK update, in first Table ("SA TEK Update")  
 \* Section 11.7.22 GKEK Parameters, in first Table ("GKEK Parameters")

Include a column named "Scope" with value "RNG-RSP" in the following Table:  
 \* Section 11.7.23 SA Challenge Tuple, in first Table ("SA Challenge")

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted Recommendation by**

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-REQ/REG-RSP" in the following Table:  
 \* Section 11.7.10 Method for allocating IP address for the secondary management connection

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-REQ" in the following Table:  
 \* Section 11.7.14 Sleep-mode recovery time

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-RSP" in the following Tables:  
 \* Section 11.7.8.9 Compressed CID update encodings  
 \* Section 11.7.9 CID update encodings, in first Table ("CID\_Update")  
 \* Section 11.7.18 SAID update encodings, in first Table ("SAID update")  
 \* Section 11.7.19 Total number of provisioned service flow  
 \* Section 11.7.21 SA TEK update, in first Table ("SA TEK Update")  
 \* Section 11.7.22 GKEK Parameters, in first Table ("GKEK Parameters")

Include a column named "Scope" with value "RNG-RSP" in the following Table:  
 \* Section 11.7.23 SA Challenge Tuple, in first Table ("SA Challenge")

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-REQ/REG-RSP" in the following Table:

\* Section 11.7.10 Method for allocating IP address for the secondary management connection

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-REQ" in the following Table:

\* Section 11.7.14 Sleep-mode recovery time

Include a column named "Scope" with value "REG-RSP" in the following Tables:

\* Section 11.7.8.9 Compressed CID update encodings

\* Section 11.7.9 CID update encodings, in first Table ("CID\_Update")

\* Section 11.7.18 SAID update encodings, in first Table ("SAID update")

\* Section 11.7.19 Total number of provisioned service flow

\* Section 11.7.21 SA TEK update, in first Table ("SA TEK Update")

\* Section 11.7.22 GKEK Parameters, in first Table ("GKEK Parameters")

Include a column named "Scope" with value "RNG-RSP" in the following Table:

\* Section 11.7.23 SA Challenge Tuple, in first Table ("SA Challenge")

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5634**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment      Type    Technical, Non-binding      Starting Page # 515      Starting Line # 16      Fig/Table#      Section 11.7

The changes in table 11.13.19.1 indicate the extension of the supported CS types. However the table of 11.7.7.1 specifying the classification/PHS options and SDU encapsulation is not extended by these new CS types.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert the following text in 11.7:

"11.7.7 Convergence Sublayer Capabilities

[Change subclause 11.7.7.1 as indicated:]

11.7.7.1 Classification/PHS options and SDU encapsulation support

This parameter indicates which classification/PHS options and SDU encapsulation the SS supports. By default, Packet, IPv4 and 802.3/Ethernet shall be supported, thus absence of this parameter in REG-REQ means that named options are supported by the SS.

When the length of the TLV is 2 bytes, it indicates that bits 16-31 are zero."

Below this description, include the TLV-table from 802.16-2004 and change its fields as follows:

\* Length: "24"

\* Value:

"Bits #9-15: Reserved; Shall be set to zero

Bit #9: Packet, IPv4 with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #10: Packet, IPv4 with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #11: Packet, IPv6 with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #12: Packet, IPv6 with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #13: Packet, IPv4 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #14: Packet, IPv4 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #15: Packet, IPv6 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #16: Packet, IPv6 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #17: Packet, IPv4 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #18: Packet, IPv4 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #19: Packet, IPv6 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #20: Packet, IPv6 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bits #21-31: Reserved; Shall be set to zero"

**Proposed Resolution      Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Insert the following text in 11.7:

"11.7.7 Convergence Sublayer Capabilities

[Change subclause 11.7.7.1 as indicated:]

11.7.7.1 Classification/PHS options and SDU encapsulation support

This parameter indicates which classification/PHS options and SDU encapsulation the SS supports. By default, Packet, IPv4 and 802.3/Ethernet shall be supported, thus absence of this parameter in REG-REQ means that named options are supported by the SS.

When the length of the TLV is 2 bytes, it indicates that bits 16-31 are zero "

When the length of the TLV is 2 bytes, it indicates that bits 16-31 are zero.

Below this description, include the TLV-table from 802.16-2004 and change its fields as follows:

\* Length: "24"

\* Value:

"Bits #9-15: Reserved; Shall be set to zero

Bit #9: Packet, IPv4 with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #10: Packet, IPv4 with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #11: Packet, IPv6 with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #12: Packet, IPv6 with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #13: Packet, IPv4 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #14: Packet, IPv4 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #15: Packet, IPv6 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #16: Packet, IPv6 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #17: Packet, IPv4 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #18: Packet, IPv4 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #19: Packet, IPv6 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #20: Packet, IPv6 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bits #21-31: Reserved; Shall be set to zero"

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Insert the following text in 11.7:

"11.7.7 Convergence Sublayer Capabilities

[Change subclause 11.7.7.1 as indicated:]

11.7.7.1 Classification/PHS options and SDU encapsulation support

This parameter indicates which classification/PHS options and SDU encapsulation the SS supports. By default, Packet, IPv4 and 802.3/Ethernet shall be supported, thus absence of this parameter in REG-REQ means that named options are supported by the SS.

When the length of the TLV is 2 bytes, it indicates that bits 16-31 are zero."

Below this description, include the TLV-table from 802.16-2004 and change its fields as follows:

\* Length: "24"

\* Value:

"Bits #9-15: Reserved; Shall be set to zero

Bit #9: Packet, IPv4 with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #10: Packet, IPv4 with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #11: Packet, IPv6 with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #12: Packet, IPv6 with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #13: Packet, IPv4 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #14: Packet, IPv4 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #15: Packet, IPv6 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #16: Packet, IPv6 over 802.3/Ethernet with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #17: Packet, IPv4 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #18: Packet, IPv4 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ECRTP)

Bit #19: Packet, IPv6 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ROHC)

Bit #20: Packet, IPv6 over 802.1Q VLAN with Header Compression (ECRTP)  
Bits #21-31: Reserved; Shall be set to zero"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**                      **Editor's Actions**    [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5635**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **515** Starting Line # **16** Fig/Table# Section **11.7.7.3**

There are a number of new packet header suppression and/or compression options but there is currently no mechanism for signalling the MS and BS capabilities during a REG-REQ/RSP exchange.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add an update to section 11.7.7.3 "PHS support" to include the indicated text changes - "This parameter indicates the level of PHS packet header suppression and compression support:

Bit #0: ATM PHSBit #1: Packet PHSBit #2: ROHCBit #3: ECRTTPBit #4-#7: reserved**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superseded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See comment 5634.](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** [1\) none needed](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5636**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **515** Starting Line # **22** Fig/Table# Section **11.7.8.9**

Compressed CID update encodings is not a SS capability encoding.

**Suggested Remedy**

Move Section 11.7.8.9 after Section 11.7.9 (just before 11.7.10) and renumber it appropriately (so that its new number is 11.7.9.1).

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Move Section 11.7.8.9 after Section 11.7.9 (just before 11.7.10) and renumber it appropriately (so that its new number is 11.7.9.1).

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Move Section 11.7.8.9 after Section 11.7.9 (just before 11.7.10) and renumber it appropriately (so that its new number is 11.7.9.1).

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5637**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **515** Starting Line # **33** Fig/Table# Section **11.7.8.9**

The description of the "Compressed CID Update" indicates that the first byte contains the length of the bitmap in number of bytes. This is a redundant field because the structure of all TLVs includes a length (L) in the header.

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the first sentence which reads "~~The first one byte indicates the length of the following BITMAP in bytes~~".

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

The first ~~one~~ byte indicates the length of the following BITMAP in bytes. The n-th MSB of the BITMAP set to 1 when the n-th old CID is successfully updated to new one. Where, the old CIDs are sorted with increasing order.

After the BITMAP, a list of new CID follows. The number of new CID is equal to the number of ~~4ones~~ in the BITMAP.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

The first ~~one~~ byte indicates the length of the following BITMAP in bytes. The n-th MSB of the BITMAP set to 1 when the n-th old CID is successfully updated to new one. Where, the old CIDs are sorted with increasing order.

After the BITMAP, a list of new CID follows. The number of new CID is equal to the number of ~~4ones~~ in the BITMAP.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5638**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **515** Starting Line # **35** Fig/Table# Section **11.7.8.9**

Elsewhere in D8, the order of CID updates has been changed so that the ordering is based on SFID rather than on "Old CID" because the value of the SFID is invariant and does not change during handover.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change this sentence to read - "The n-th MSB of the BITMAP set to 1 when the n-th ~~old CID~~ SFID is ~~successfully~~ to be updated to a new ~~one~~ CID. Where, the ~~old CIDs~~ SFIDs are sorted with increasing order".

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Change this sentence to read - "The n-th bit, starting from the MSB of the BITMAP is set to 1 when the n-th ~~old CID~~ SFID is ~~successfully~~ to be updated to a new ~~one~~ CID. Where, the ~~old CIDs~~ SFIDs are sorted with increasing order".

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change this sentence to read - "The n-th bit, starting from the MSB of the BITMAP is set to 1 when the n-th ~~old CID~~ SFID is ~~successfully~~ to be updated to a new ~~one~~ CID. Where, the ~~old CIDs~~ SFIDs are sorted with increasing order".

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5639**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type <b>Technical, Non-binding</b>	Starting Page # <b>515</b>	Starting Line # <b>43</b>	Fig/Table#	Section <b>11.7.8.10</b>
---------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	------------	--------------------------

The following sections contain a lot of TLVs without correct type-numbers:

- \* 11.7.8.10,
- \* 11.7.12.2,
- \* 11.7.21 until 11.7.26 and
- \* 11.13.31 until 11.13.33

**Suggested Remedy**

Include TLV-Type nrs.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Editor is kindly requested to update TLV numbers as appropriate.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Editor is kindly requested to update TLV numbers as appropriate.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5640**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **516** Starting Line # **57** Fig/Table# Section **11.7.8.14**

Section 11.7.8.14 and its subclauses refer as scope to SBC-REQ/SBC-RSP, but they are in the REG-REQ/RSP section.

**Suggested Remedy**

Option 1:  
Change the scope in all three TLV-tables in Sections 11.7.8.14, 11.7.8.14.1 and 11.7.8.14.2, as follows:  
~~"SBC-REQ/SBC-RSP~~REG-REQ/REG-RSP"

Option 2:  
Move the Sections (and renumber appropriately) to be subsections of 11.8.3.7 (e.g. 11.7.8.14 becomes 11.8.3.7.16).

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by  
Move the Sections (and renumber appropriately) to be subsections of 11.8.3.7 (e.g. 11.7.8.14 becomes 11.8.3.7.16).

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group** Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**  
Move the Sections (and renumber appropriately) to be subsections of 11.8.3.7 (e.g. 11.7.8.14 becomes 11.8.3.7.16).

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

**Group's Notes**  
**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes** Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5641**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **518** Starting Line # **43** Fig/Table# Section **11.7.9**

Elsewhere in D8, the signalling of CID updates has been changed so that the reference is based on SFID rather than on "Old CID" because the value of the SFID is invariant and does not change during handover.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text to read -

Name	Type	Length	Value
<del>Old_CID</del>	<del>16.2</del>	<del>2</del>	<del>Old_CID before hand over from old BS.</del>
SFID	16.2	4	SFID to be updated to the New_CID value.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change text to read -

Name	Type	Length	Value
<del>Old_CID</del>	<del>16.2</del>	<del>2</del>	<del>Old_CID before hand over from old BS.</del>
SFID	16.2	4	SFID to be updated to the New_CID value.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

See comment 5306.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5642**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	519	Starting Line #	48	Fig/Table#	Section	11.7.2
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------

The "HO Support" TLVs ("System Resource Retain Time" and "HO Process Optimization MS Timer") are currently defined for use in a REG-RSP message for use during network re-entry, but a REG-RSP is not always required on re-entry. These TLVs should be associated with the "HO Process Optimization" TLV sent in a RNG-RSP message sent when an MS is attempting to perform re-entry, association or handover.

**Suggested Remedy**

Move §11.7.12 from "REG-REQ/RSP management message encodings" to §11.6 "RNG-RSP TLVs for re-establishment of service flows"

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Per 6.3.21.2.7 Network entry/re-entry, page 180, line 19, the MS may 'include REG-RSP specific or SBC-RSP specific message items as TLV items in the RNG-RSP.'

So the standard already allows those TLVs, really any SBC-RSP or REG-RSP TLV, to be included in a RNG-RSP during HO, as appropriate.

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Per 6.3.21.2.7 Network entry/re-entry, page 180, line 19, the MS may 'include REG-RSP specific or SBC-RSP specific message items as TLV items in the RNG-RSP.'

So the standard already allows those TLVs, really any SBC-RSP or REG-RSP TLV, to be included in a RNG-RSP during HO, as appropriate.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5643**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **525** Starting Line # **35**Fig/Table# Section **11.7.23**

This Section describes a TLV that is used only in RNG-RSP messages.

**Suggested Remedy**

Move Section 11.7.23 to 11.6 and renumber to 11.6.1

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Move Section 11.7.23 to 11.6 and renumber to 11.6.1

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Move Section 11.7.23 to 11.6 and renumber to 11.6.1

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions **k) done****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5644**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **526** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **11.7.25**  
 DVJ258(subclause=11.7.25,page=526,line=32):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5645**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **526** Starting Line # **49**

Fig/Table# Section **11.7.26**

Section does not refer to HO headers.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change section title as follows:  
"11.7.26 HO header support"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change section title as follows:  
"11.7.26 HO header support"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

Handled by another comment?

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5646**Comment submitted by: **David V.****James****Member****2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **527** Starting Line # **9** Fig/Table# Section **11.7.26**  
 DVJ259(subclause=11.7.26,page=527,line=9):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5647**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Cudak**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **529** Starting Line # **14** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.3.7.2**

"HARQ with SPID=0" is not defined by the standard; this is the only occurrence of the 'feature'. It is unclear what this is or how it works. If the feature is to remain, it must be described by normative text.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change description of bit#7 back to "reserved"

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Change description of bit#7 back to "reserved"

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change description of bit#7 back to "reserved"

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5648**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **529** Starting Line # **31** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.3.7.3**  
 DVJ261(subclause=11.8.3.7.3,page=529,line=31):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5649**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **529** Starting Line # **38** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.3.7.3**

Table is flawed. Fragments of old text. Also, the length is always 1 and there are no bits 8-15 (as referred to by the note below the Table)

**Suggested Remedy**

- \* Remove in description of Bit#3: "AAS Diversity Map Scan",
- \* Remove in description of bit#4: "AAS Direct Signaling".
- \* Remove the note below the table entry ("When the length ... are zero").

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

- \* Remove in description of Bit#3: "AAS Diversity Map Scan",
- \* Remove in description of bit#4: "AAS Direct Signaling".
- \* Remove the note below the table entry ("When the length ... are zero").

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

- \* Remove in description of Bit#3: "AAS Diversity Map Scan",
- \* Remove in description of bit#4: "AAS Direct Signaling".
- \* Remove the note below the table entry ("When the length ... are zero").

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5650**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **529** Starting Line # **47** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.3.7.3**  
 DVJ260(subclause=11.8.3.7.3,page=529,line=47):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5651**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **532** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.3.7.9**

Under negotiation for SBC Fast-feedback , SS has to negotiate the use of the 3 bit-MIMO Fast-feedback and DIUC-CQI Fast-feedback. However, these negotiation fields are missing in SBC 'Uplink control channel support' There is no CQI type for allocation Fast-feedback channel in section 8.3.4.5.21.

**Suggested Remedy**

*modify the table line 10~31 in page 532, section 11.8.3.7.9 as following]*

Type	Length	Value	Scope
173	1	bit #0: <del>Reserved; shall be set to zero.</del> <a href="#">3 bit-MIMO Fast-feedback</a> bit #1: Enhanced FAST_FEEDBACK Under negotiation for SBC fast feedback , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced fast feedback channel in the CQICH allocation IE ( <del>subclause</del> <a href="#">8.4.5.4.12</a> ) <a href="#">and 8.4.5.3.21</a> . bit #2: UL ACK bit #3: Enhanced UL ACK Under negotiation for UL ACK , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced UL ACK channel. bit #4: UEP fast-feedback bit #5: A measurement report shall be performed on the last DL burst, as described in <a href="#">8.4.5.4.10.1</a> bit #6: Primary/Secondary FAST_FEEDBACK bit #7: <del>Reserved; shall be set to zero.</del> <a href="#">DIUC-CQI Fast-feedback</a>	SBC-REQ (see 6.3.2.3.23) SBC-RSP (see 6.3.2.3.24)

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*modify the table line 10~31 in page 532, section 11.8.3.7.9 as following]*

Type	Length	Value	Scope
173	1	bit #0: <del>Reserved; shall be set to zero.</del> <a href="#">3 bit-MIMO Fast-feedback</a> bit #1: Enhanced FAST_FEEDBACK Under negotiation for SBC fast feedback , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use	SBC-REQ (see 6.3.2.3.23) SBC-RSP (see 6.3.2.3.24)



enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced fast feedback channel in the CQICH allocation IE (~~subclause 8.4.5.4.12~~ and 8.4.5.3.21).

bit #2: UL ACK  
bit #3: Enhanced UL ACK  
Under negotiation for UL ACK , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced UL ACK channel.

bit #4: UEP fast-feedback  
bit #5: A measurement report shall be performed on the last DL burst, as described in 8.4.5.4.10.1  
bit #6: Primary/Secondary FAST\_FEEDBACK  
bit #7: ~~Reserved; shall be set to zero.~~DIUC-CQI Fast-feedback

## Reason for Recommendation

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

*modify the table line 10~31 in page 532, section 11.8.3.7.9 as following]*

Type	Length	Value	Scope
173	1	bit #0: <del>Reserved; shall be set to zero.</del> 3 bit-MIMO Fast-feedback bit #1: Enhanced FAST_FEEDBACK Under negotiation for SBC fast feedback , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced fast feedback channel in the CQICH allocation IE ( <del>subclause 8.4.5.4.12</del> and 8.4.5.3.21). bit #2: UL ACK bit #3: Enhanced UL ACK Under negotiation for UL ACK , if enhanced feature is enabled, the SS should use only the enhanced UL ACK channel. bit #4: UEP fast-feedback bit #5: A measurement report shall be performed on the last DL burst, as described in 8.4.5.4.10.1 bit #6: Primary/Secondary FAST_FEEDBACK bit #7: <del>Reserved; shall be set to zero.</del> DIUC-CQI Fast-feedback	SBC-REQ (see 6.3.2.3.23) SBC-RSP (see 6.3.2.3.24)

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5652**                      Comment submitted by: Hang                      Zhang                      Member                      2005/06/08Comment                      Type **Technical, Non-binding**                      Starting Page # **536**                      Starting Line # **59**                      Fig/Table#                      Section **11.8.4.2**

Authorisation policies to be enforced on handover are dictated by the BS, not by the MS. Therefore, authorisation policies to be used on handover must appear in a SBC-RSP message sent from the BS to the MS, not in the SBC-REQ message sent from the MS to the BS.

## Suggested Remedy

Change sentence to read - "Bit# 4-6 are only applied to the ~~SBC-REQ~~RSP message. Those bits shall be set to 0 in the ~~SBC-RSP~~REQ message".

Proposed Resolution                      Recommendation: **Rejected**                      Recommendation by

## Reason for Recommendation

The commenter's intent is already supported by the standard

Resolution of Group                      Decision of Group: **Rejected-Duplicate**

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The commenter's intent is already supported by the standard

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes                      Editor's Actions    l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5653**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ263(subclause=11.8.4.2,page=537,line=12): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **537** Starting Line # **12**

Fig/Table# Section **11.8.4.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Bit #0

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Bit #0

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5654**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **537** Starting Line # **12** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.4.2**  
 DVJ264(subclause=11.8.4.2,page=537,line=12):  
 Table columns containing single word, numbers, or  
 sentence fragments should be centered.

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Bit #1

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Center the column under header: Bit #1

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5655**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was DVJ265(subclause=11.8.4.2,page=537,line=12): Table columns containing single word, numbers, or sentence fragments should be centered.**

Starting Page # **537** Starting Line # **12**

Fig/Table# Section **11.8.4.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

Center the column under header: Bit #2

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Center the column under header: Bit #2

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5656**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **537** Starting Line # **15** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.4.2**  
 DVJ262(subclause=11.8.4.2,page=537,line=15):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5657**

Comment submitted by: Phillip

Barber

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **538** Starting Line # **19** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.5**)

I object to the resolution of the comment that restructured 11.8.5 Power save classes capability in sleep mode (sorry, I found the change in the D7delta document but could not find the originating comment).

Problem: Problems with the Table. Sleep classes not specified. Seems to make Sleep class '1' mandatory though Sleep Mode is optional.

Remedy is to clarify invoking language for TLV usage and 'Value' descriptions.

The truth is that I don't know what the 'Value' descriptions should be. What is the difference between Bit#0 power save class supported and Bit#1 power save class supported? Hopefully someone will provide clarifying language in Reply Comments. Vladimir?

**Suggested Remedy**

*[In 11.8.5 Power save classes capability in sleep mode, page 537, line 22, modify as:]*

'For MS supporting Sleep Mode, ~~F~~this parameter defines the capability of the MS supporting different power save class IDs in sleep mode.'

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

*[In 11.8.5 Power save classes capability in sleep mode, page 537, line 22, modify as:]*

'For MS supporting Sleep Mode, ~~F~~this parameter defines the capability of the MS supporting different power save class types IDs in sleep mode.'

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

*[In 11.8.5 Power save classes capability in sleep mode, page 537, line 22, modify as:]*

'For MS supporting Sleep Mode, ~~F~~this parameter defines the capability of the MS supporting different power save class types IDs in sleep mode.'

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5658**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	538	Starting Line #	19	Fig/Table#	Section	11.8.5
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------

Editorial error for accepted comment in session 37,  
Removal of first capability bit which is redundant (always 1)

**Suggested Remedy**

*Change the following in section 11.8.5 Power save classes capability in sleep mode*

~~Bit #0: power save class supported (shall be set to 1):~~  
 Bit #10: power save class 2 supported.  
 Bit #21: power save class 3 supported.  
 Bits #32-54: number of power save class instances supported from class 1 & 2  
 Bits #65-87: number of power save class instances supported from class 3

<b>Proposed Resolution</b>	<b>Recommendation: Accepted-Modified</b>	<b>Recommendation by</b>
----------------------------	--	--------------------------

*Change the following in section 11.8.5 Power save classes capability in sleep mode*

11.8.5 Power save classes ~~es~~ types capability ~~in-sleep-mode~~

*Change the table as indicated:*

~~Bit #0: power save class supported (shall be set to 1):~~  
 Bit #10: power save class type 1 supported.  
 Bit #21: power save class type 2 supported.  
 Bit #2: power save class type 3 supported.  
 Bits #3-54: number of power save class instances supported from class types 1 & 2  
 Bits #65-87: number of power save class instances supported from class type 3

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*Change the following in section 11.8.5 Power save classes capability in sleep mode*

11.8.5 Power save classes ~~es~~ types capability ~~in-sleep-mode~~



*Change the table as indicated:*

~~Bit #0: power save class supported (shall be set to 1).~~

Bit #10: power save class type 1 supported.

Bit #21: power save class type 2 supported.

Bit #2: power save class type 3 supported.

Bits #3-54: number of power save class instances supported from class types 1 & 2

Bits #65-87: number of power save class instances supported from class type 3

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5659**Comment submitted by: **Beomjoon****Kim****Other****2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **538** Starting Line # **30** Fig/Table# Section **11.8.5**

Power save classes capability in sleep mode TLV is for SBC-REQ/RSP. However, its type field looks like DSx-related.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace  
[145/146].cst.3.xx  
with  
26  
in Type field.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Rejected at the request of commenter.****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions **1) none needed****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5660**

Comment submitted by: **Seokheon**

**Cho**

Other

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **538** Starting Line # **58** Fig/Table# Section **11.9**

Some attributes used in the PKM-REQ/RSP messages are not defined in the PKM-REQ/RSP management message encodings.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/279.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/279.

Then make the following changes:

Change the last sentence of the contribution to

"The OMAC-Digest's or HMAC-Digest's authentication key is derived from the ~~AK~~-EIK .

Also change the reference RFC 2284bis to RFC 3748

Also change all instances of "EAP method protocol" to "EAP method"

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Adopt the contribution C802.16e-05/279.

Then make the following changes:

Change the last sentence of the contribution to

"The OMAC-Digest's or HMAC-Digest's authentication key is derived from the ~~AK~~-EIK .

Also change the reference RFC 2284bis to RFC 3748

Also change all instances of "EAP method protocol" to "EAP method"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [\(1\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8** Ballot Number: **0001045** Comment Date

Comment # **5661** Comment submitted by: **Panyuh Joo** Member **2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **539** Starting Line # **9** Fig/Table# **370** Section **11.9**  
According to the accepted comment #4367, the EAP-Master-Key-Id section was deleted but there still remains the EAP-Master-Key-Id as a PKM attribute type in Table 370.

Suggested Remedy

Modify the "EAP-Master-Key-Id" with "reserved".

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Modify the "EAP-Master-Key-Id" with "reserved".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [\(1\) none needed](#)

[Done by another comment.](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5662**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **540** Starting Line # **31**

Fig/Table#

Section **11.9.19**

PKM configuration settings - message name correction

**Suggested Remedy**

In PKM configuration settings defined in 11.9.19 :  
Change "auth-reply " to "PKMv2 RSA reply message".

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

In PKM configuration settings defined in 11.9.19 :  
Change "auth-reply " to "PKMv2 RSA reply message".

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**     none needed

Removed by another comment.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5663**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **543** Starting Line # **9**

Fig/Table# **377** Section **11.9.14**

Add an Empty security suite to allow negotiating of not encrypted Service flow

**Suggested Remedy**

[Contribution no C80216e-05\\_285.doc](#)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Rejected**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

An empty security suite for TEK algorithm does not make sense from a security point of view. Also TEK state machines are not invoked if service flows are not encrypted.

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Rejected**

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

An empty security suite for TEK algorithm does not make sense from a security point of view. Also TEK state machines are not invoked if service flows are not encrypted.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5664**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **544**

Starting Line # **51**

Fig/Table#

Section

**11.9.20**

The length of Nonce is 32 bits not 32 bytes.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the length of Nonce TLV from 32 to 4.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Change the length of Nonce TLV from 32 to 4.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change the length of Nonce TLV from 32 to 4.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions **k) done**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5665**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **547** Starting Line # **7**Fig/Table# Section **11.9.27**

The length of SigBS is wrong. The calculation of the SigBS is not clearly described in the text.

**Suggested Remedy**

1. Change the Length of the SigBS TLV from 20 to 128.
2. Add the following sentence to the end of the Value description:  
This value is calculated using PKCS #1 OAEP 1.5 signing algorithm with SHA-1 hash.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

1. Change the Length of the SigBS TLV from 20 to 128.
2. Add the following sentence to the end of the Value description:  
This value is calculated using PKCS #1 OAEP 1.5 signing algorithm with SHA-1 hash.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

1. Change the Length of the SigBS TLV from 20 to 128.
2. Add the following sentence to the end of the Value description:  
This value is calculated using PKCS #1 OAEP 1.5 signing algorithm with SHA-1 hash.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5666**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **549** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# Section **11.9.33**  
 DVJ266(subclause=11.9.33,page=549,line=53):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5667**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **549** Starting Line # **64**Fig/Table# Section **11.9.33**

The length of SigSS is wrong. The calculation of the SigSS is not clearly described in the text.

**Suggested Remedy**

1. Change the Length of the SigSS TLV from 20 to 128.
2. Add the following sentence to the end of the Value description:

This value is calculated using RSASSA-PKCS-v1\_5-Sign algorithm with SHA-1 hash.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

1. Change the Length of the SigSS TLV from 20 to 128.
2. Add the following sentence to the end of the Value description:

This value is calculated using RSASSA-PKCS-v1\_5-Sign algorithm with SHA-1 hash.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

1. Change the Length of the SigSS TLV from 20 to 128.
2. Add the following sentence to the end of the Value description:

This value is calculated using RSASSA-PKCS-v1\_5-Sign algorithm with SHA-1 hash.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5668**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # 550 Starting Line # 12 Fig/Table# Section 11.9.34  
 DVJ267(subclause=11.9.34,page=550,line=12):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5669**

Comment submitted by: Jeff

Mandin

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **550** Starting Line # **20** Fig/Table# Section **11.9.35**

From IETF review:

IEEE 802.16e D8 does not ensure that the PMK is bound to context such as the key lifetime and scope.

....

Since EAP authenticators may have multiple ports, the EAP peer needs to be aware of the authenticator identity; this is not defined in IEEE 802.16e D8.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt contribution "Definition of PMK scope via AuthenticatorId" ( C80216e-5\_280 )

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**

**Recommendation by**

[Insert the following paragraph to page 230 line 56:]

The 3-way handshake demonstrates liveness of the BS and MS, proves mutual possession of the AK, and activates all of the AKs associated with the authenticator together with their AK context. When performing HO to a target BS associated with the same authenticator (as indicated in NBR\_ADV) as the serving BS, no 3-way handshake is required - as all AKs on the authenticator are already active.

[Add the following to table 358 (DCD Channel Encoding):]

AuthenticatorId | <code> | variable | the identity of an EAP authenticator associated with the BS

[Insert new section 11.9.35:]

AuthenticatorId

Description: The Identity of the EAP Authenticator associated with the BS. This is the value that is used as the NAS\_Identifier AAA attribute

Type | Length | Value

Tbd | variable | Identity of the EAP Authenticator associated with the BS

[Delete the following text from table 108f and renumber the text entries lying below it:]

~~Bit #1: Omit PKM Authentication phase except TEK phase during current re-entry processing~~

[Delete the following text from page 115 line 53 and renumber the text entries lying below it:]

[Delete the following text from page 115 line 52 and renumber the text entries lying below it.]

~~Bit #1: Omit PKM Authentication phase except TEK phase during current re-entry processing~~

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Rejected**

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

To adopt the concept of authenticator ID shall provide and specify new network architecture.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** 1) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5670**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **552** Starting Line # **40** Fig/Table# Section **11.13**  
 DVJ268(subclause=11.13,page=552,line=40):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5671**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **553** Starting Line # **11** Fig/Table# Section **11.13.11**  
 DVJ269(subclause=11.13.11,page=553,line=11):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5672**

Comment submitted by: **Panyuh**

**Joo**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial**  
Editorial.

Starting Page # **553** Starting Line # **34**

Fig/Table# Section **11.13.18.8**

Suggested Remedy  
Change '46' to '**16**'.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**  
Change '46' to '**16**'.

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted**  
Change '46' to '**16**'.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5673**

Comment submitted by: Lei

Wang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	554	Starting Line #	16	Fig/Table#	Section	11.13.19.1
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	------------

The CS 10 to 21, i.e. line 16 to line 27 on page 554, have no procedures defined in Section 5 to support those convergence sublayers. Without definitions of those CS, why do we have to add those codepoints in the TLV?

Also, we believe the correct solution is to define a generic packet convergence sublayer that supports multiple protocols over 802.16 air interface and also it allows adding new protocol over 802.16 without requiring any modifications in 802.16 standard. This will provide 802.16 CS a much better scalability. Please see another Lei's comment for this proposal.

**Suggested Remedy**

1. delete line 16 to line 27 on page 554;
2. on line 28 page 554, change "22-255" to "10 - 255"
3. delete line 59 to 61 on page 554
4. delete line 1 to 22 on page 555

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Same procedures may be used which are defined for IPv4 and IPv6 CS options.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** ) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5674**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	554	Starting Line #	52	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------

Encodings are different from those in 802.16-2004 (106 and 107 are duplicates)

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to

106 Packet IPV4 over 802.1Q VLAN

107 Packet IPV6 over 802.1Q VLAN

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Change as indicated

106 Packet IPV4 over ~~802.3/Ethernet~~802.1Q VLAN107 Packet IPV6 over ~~802.3/Ethernet~~802.1Q VLAN**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change as indicated

106 Packet IPV4 over ~~802.3/Ethernet~~802.1Q VLAN107 Packet IPV6 over ~~802.3/Ethernet~~802.1Q VLAN**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5675**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **555** Starting Line # **58** Fig/Table# Section **11.13.19.3.4.17**  
 page 555, line 58, section 11.13.19.3.4.17, TLV type incorrect.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change TLV-type as follows:  
 "[145/146].~~est.3-xx~~" (check type number)

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

We do not understand what this means.  
 CS encoding rule is very various as shown in 11.13.19.2

**Group's Notes**

The entire subclause 11.13.19.3.4.17 needs to be re-written by someone who understands it.

**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5676**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **557** Starting Line # **23** Fig/Table# Section **11.13.23**  
 DVJ270(subclause=11.13.23,page=557,line=23):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5677**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **558** Starting Line # **40**

Fig/Table# Section **11.13**

The following sections were omitted from D8 draft (it was part of D7 draft)

11.13.28 Unsolicited grant interval

11.13.29 Unsolicited polling interval

The suggestion is to put back those section

**Suggested Remedy**

Put back sections:

11.13.28 Unsolicited grant interval

11.13.29 Unsolicited polling interval

as defined in 16eD7 draft.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Rejected**

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

This text was intentionally removed during Session 37 (see comment 4476).

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** ) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5678**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

**Cudak**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **559** Starting Line # **11**

Fig/Table# Section **11.13.26**

TLV type incorrect.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change TLV-type as follows:

"~~44~~[145/146].~~xx44~~" (check TLV type number)

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by**

Change TLV-type as follows:

"~~44~~[145/146].~~xx44~~" (check TLV type number)

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change TLV-type as follows:

"~~44~~[145/146].~~xx44~~" (check TLV type number)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5679**

Comment submitted by: Hang

Zhang

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **559** Starting Line # **60** Fig/Table# Section **11.13.31**

The Authorization Token is a generic mechanism (RFC 3521) that is not tied to IMS-based service creation and modification procedures. The text should indicate that 802.16 supports the generic mechanisms and is not tied to a specific implementation (i.e. IMS).

**Suggested Remedy**

Change text to read - "... it is used for authorizing the QoS for one or more IP flows generated by ~~IMS-based~~ higher-level service creation/modification procedures. The token is provided to the MS by the higher-level service through some mechanism that is outside the scope of this specification. The MS must include the token in this TLV exactly as received from the higher-level service and must treat the token as an opaque octet string whose meaning is of significance only to those higher-level services".

Also change description on page 560 to read - "Authorization token which is used for authorizing the QoS for one or ~~more IP~~ more IP service flows generated by MS-initiated ~~IMS-based~~ higher-level service flow creation or modification procedures".

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**

Change text to read - "... it is used for authorizing the QoS for one or more IP flows generated by ~~IMS-based~~ higher-level service creation/modification procedures. The token is provided to the MS by the higher-level service through some mechanism that is outside the scope of this specification. The MS must include the token in this TLV exactly as received from the higher-level service and must treat the token as an opaque octet string whose meaning is of significance only to those higher-level services".

Also change description on page 560 to read - "Authorization token which is used for authorizing the QoS for one or ~~more IP~~ more IP service flows generated by MS-initiated ~~IMS-based~~ higher-level service flow creation or modification procedures".

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change text to read - "... it is used for authorizing the QoS for one or more IP flows generated by ~~IMS-based~~ higher-level service creation/modification procedures. The token is provided to the MS by the higher-level service through some mechanism that is outside the scope of this specification. The MS must include the token in this TLV exactly as received from the higher-level service and must treat the token as an opaque octet string whose meaning is of significance only to those higher-level services".

Also change description on page 560 to read - "Authorization token which is used for authorizing the QoS for one or ~~more IP~~ more IP service flows generated by MS-initiated ~~IMS-based~~ higher-level service flow creation or modification procedures".

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**





Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5680**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **560** Starting Line # **43** Fig/Table# Section **11.13.33**  
 PDU SN Extended Subheader - REQ/RSP exchange clarification

**Suggested Remedy**[\[Change section 11.13.33\]](#)

## 11.13.33 PDU SN Extended Subheader for HARQ reordering

This TLV is valid only in HARQ enabled connection. It specifies whether PDU SN extended subheader should be applied by the transmitter on every PDU on this connection. This SN may be used by the receiver to ensure PDU ordering.

This counter should start at 0 and should be reset after HHO/FBSS operations

The relevance connections of this parameter when appears in REG-REQ/RSP messages are Basic, Primary and Secondary CIDs (each should have its own PDU numbering)

~~This TLV can only be set by the BS side.~~

Value of 0 in either of the messages means the endpoint does not support the PDU SN number for the specific connection. If both end points support PDU SN for the connection the larger SN number should be chosen.

[\[Change the "value' column data in the table as followed\]](#)

0 – ~~No PDU SN extended SH~~ No support for PDU SN in this connection (default)

1 - PDU SN (short) extended SH

2 - PDU SN (long) extended SH

3-256—reserved.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by**[\[Change section 11.13.33\]](#)

## 11.13.33 PDU SN Extended Subheader for HARQ reordering

This TLV is valid only in HARQ enabled connection. It specifies whether PDU SN extended subheader should be applied by the transmitter on every PDU on this connection. This SN may be used by the receiver to ensure PDU ordering.

This counter should start at 0 and should be reset after HHO/FBSS operations

The relevance connections of this parameter when appears in REG-REQ/RSP messages are Basic, Primary and Secondary CIDs (each should have its own PDU numbering)

~~This TLV can only be set by the BS side.~~

Value of 0 in either of the messages means the endpoint does not support the PDU SN number for the specific connection

Value of 0 in either of the messages means the endpoint does not support the PDU SN number for the specific connection. If both end points support PDU SN for the connection the larger SN number should be chosen.

*[Change the "value' column data in the table as followed]*

0 – ~~No PDU SN extended SH~~ No support for PDU SN in this connection (default)  
 1 - PDU SN (short) extended SH  
 2 - PDU SN (long) extended SH  
 3-256—reserved.

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

*[Change section 11.13.33]*

#### 11.13.33 PDU SN Extended Subheader for HARQ reordering

This TLV is valid only in HARQ enabled connection. It specifies whether PDU SN extended subheader should be applied by the transmitter on every PDU on this connection. This SN may be used by the receiver to ensure PDU ordering.

This counter should start at 0 and should be reset after HHO/FBSS operations

The relevance connections of this parameter when appears in REG-REQ/RSP messages are Basic, Primary and Secondary CIDs (each should have its own PDU numbering)

~~This TLV can only be set by the BS side.~~

Value of 0 in either of the messages means the endpoint does not support the PDU SN number for the specific connection. If both end points support PDU SN for the connection the larger SN number should be chosen.

*[Change the "value' column data in the table as followed]*

0 – ~~No PDU SN extended SH~~ No support for PDU SN in this connection (default)  
 1 - PDU SN (short) extended SH  
 2 - PDU SN (long) extended SH  
 3-256—reserved.

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5681**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Cudak****Member****2005/06/08**Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**Starting Page # **560** Starting Line # **58**

Fig/Table#

Section **11.13.36**

Section has no title.

## Suggested Remedy

Insert new section-header (below editorial instruction):

"11.13.36 MBS Contents IDs"

## Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Insert new section-header (below editorial instruction):

"11.13.36 MBS contents IDs"

## Reason for Recommendation

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Insert new section-header (below editorial instruction):

"11.13.36 MBS contents IDs"

## Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

## Group's Notes

## Group's Action Items

## Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

## Editor's Questions and Concerns

## Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5682**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **561** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **11.13.33**  
 DVJ271(subclause=11.13.33,page=561,line=32):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5683**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **561** Starting Line # **43** Fig/Table# Section **11.14**

The TLV encoding for DREG-REQ (SS-initiated) and DREG-CMD (BS-initiated) are very similar and are basically copied from each other. In order to maintain standard consistency and remove unnecessary definitions which are "copy-paste" from various parts of the standard, and in line with other TLV encodings (e.g. REG-REQ/RSP, SBC-REQ/RSP) which are always provided for message-couples, it is suggested to merge these 2 sections.

**Suggested Remedy**

Specific changes in the standard:

**[Change in section 11.14, p.561]****Change section name: 11.14 DREG-CMD/REQ Message Encodings****Add to end of table:**

Paging cycle request Type=52 Length=2 Value= Requested Cycle in which the paging message is transmitted within the paging group.

**[Completely delete section 11.15]****Delete section 11.15 (DREG-REQ Message Encodings)**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

Specific changes in the standard:

**[Change in section 11.14, p.561]****Change section name: 11.14 DREG-CMD/REQ Message Encodings****Add to end of table:**

Paging cycle request Type=52 Length=2 Value= Requested Cycle in which the paging message is transmitted within the paging group.

**[Completely delete section 11.15]****Delete section 11.15 (DREG-REQ Message Encodings)****Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Specific changes in the standard:

**[Change in section 11.14, p.561]****Change section name: 11.14 DREG-CMD/REQ Message Encodings****Add to end of table:**

Paging cycle request Type=52 Length=2 Value= Requested Cycle in which the paging message is transmitted within the paging group.

**[Completely delete section 11.15]**

*Delete section 11.15 (DREG-REQ Message Encodings)*

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5684**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type Editorial, Satisfied (was Starting Page # **567** Starting Line # **45** Fig/Table# Section **11.19.1**  
 DVJ272(subclause=11.19.1,page=567,line=45):  
 Wrong line widths.

**Suggested Remedy**

- 1) Very thing between cells.
- 2) Thin around header and body.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5685**

Comment submitted by: **David V.**

**James**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **569** Starting Line # **22**

Fig/Table# Section **12.3**

DVJ275(subclause=12.3,page=569,line=22):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

System Profiles  
==>  
system profiles

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

System Profiles  
==>  
system profiles

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5686**Comment submitted by: [David V.](#)[James](#)

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ274(subclause=12.3.1,page=569,line=24): English words should not be capitalized simply because their meaning is different from normal English usage.	<a href="#">Editorial</a> , <a href="#">Satisfied</a> (was	<a href="#">569</a>	<a href="#">24</a>		<a href="#">12.3.1</a>

**Suggested Remedy**[Profiles](#)

==&gt;

[profiles](#)**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: [Accepted](#)**[Profiles](#)

==&gt;

[profiles](#)**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** [g](#)) didn't have time[Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5687**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **569** Starting Line # **26**

Fig/Table# Section **12.3**

DVJ273(subclause=12.3,page=569,line=26):  
English words should not be capitalized simply because  
their meaning is different from normal English usage.

**Suggested Remedy**

System Profile  
==>  
system profile

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

System Profile  
==>  
system profile

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5688**

Comment submitted by: Panyuh

Joo

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial	574	32		

The title of a subclause 11.13.34 does not exist. And the reference to 11.13.36 should be changed to 11.13.34.

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert '11.13.34 MBS Contents Identifier and its Logical Channel ID' to Page 574, Line 32  
 Change the reference from 11.13.36 to 11.13.34 in Page 140, Line 49 and in Page 153, Line 36

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Insert '11.13.34 MBS Contents Identifier and its Logical Channel ID' to Page 574, Line 32  
 Change the reference from 11.13.36 to 11.13.34 in Page 140, Line 49 and in Page 153, Line 36

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** c) instructions unclear

It appears as though you are modifying text, but page 574 only contains a figure.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5689**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **577** Starting Line # **23** Fig/Table# Section **C.1.1**

The command HO-IND appears in the figure but not in the draft. Is this supposed to be MOB-HO-IND?

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the command name here and in all other locations to match a command in the standard or delete all of the figures that refer to it. I found occurrences in Figure C.6, C.7, D.1, D.2, D.3, etc.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change the command name here and in all other locations to match a command in the standard or delete all of the figures that refer to it. I found occurrences in Figure C.6, C.7, D.1, D.2, D.3, etc.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5690**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
DVJ276(subclause=E.1.1.1.3,page=597,line=32): Not easily readable.	Editorial, Satisfied (was	597	32		E.1.1.1.3

**Suggested Remedy**Used fixed center tabs for text,  
or fixed-point font.**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**Used fixed center tabs for text,  
or fixed-point font.**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5691**

Comment submitted by: David V.

James

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **598** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **E.1.1.1.4**  
 DVJ277(subclause=E.1.1.1.4,page=598,line=32):  
 Text looked much better in fixed-width portrait style.

**Suggested Remedy**

Do it fixed-width style, portrait mode.

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5692**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Eliaspur

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **610** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **E.2**  
 CRC 16 test vectors definition

**Suggested Remedy***[Add the following section ]***E.2 Test vectors for CRC16 CCITT X.25**

```
unsigned char crc16vector1[] = {0x01, 0x02, 0x03, 0x04, 0x05, 0x06, 0x07, 0x08, 0x09, 0x0a,
/*CRC*/                0xd3,0x8d};/* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
```

```
unsigned char crc16vector2[] = {    0x01, 0x02, 0x03, 0x04, 0x05, 0x06, 0x07, 0x08, 0x09, 0x0a,
                                0x0b, 0x0c, 0x0d, 0x0e, 0x0f, 0x10, 0x11, 0x12, 0x13, 0x14,
/*CRC*/                0xe3, 0x94};}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
```

```
unsigned char crc16[] = {0xC0, 0xFC, 0xDA, 0x37}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
unsigned char crc16A[] = {0x80, 0xCE, 0xC1, 0xEA}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
unsigned char crc16B[] = {0x80, 0xFC, 0xD7, 0xFB}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
unsigned char crc16C[] = {0xC0, 0xCE, 0xCC, 0x26}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
```

**Proposed Resolution** Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

*[Add the following section ]***E.2 Test vectors for CRC16 CCITT X.25**

```
unsigned char crc16vector1[] = {0x01, 0x02, 0x03, 0x04, 0x05, 0x06, 0x07, 0x08, 0x09, 0x0a,  
/*CRC*/                               0xd3,0x8d};/* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */  
  
unsigned char crc16vector2[] = {      0x01, 0x02, 0x03, 0x04, 0x05, 0x06, 0x07, 0x08, 0x09, 0x0a,  
                                       0x0b, 0x0c, 0x0d, 0x0e, 0x0f, 0x10, 0x11, 0x12, 0x13, 0x14,  
/*CRC*/                               0xe3, 0x94}}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */  
  
unsigned char crc16[] = {0xC0, 0xFC, 0xDA, 0x37}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */  
unsigned char crc16A[] = {0x80, 0xCE, 0xC1, 0xEA}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */  
unsigned char crc16B[] = {0x80, 0xFC, 0xD7, 0xFB}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */  
unsigned char crc16C[] = {0xC0, 0xCE, 0xCC, 0x26}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
```

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

*[Add the following section ]*

#### E.2 Test vectors for CRC16 CCITT X.25

```
unsigned char crc16vector1[] = {0x01, 0x02, 0x03, 0x04, 0x05, 0x06, 0x07, 0x08, 0x09, 0x0a,  
/*CRC*/                               0xd3,0x8d};/* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */  
  
unsigned char crc16vector2[] = {      0x01, 0x02, 0x03, 0x04, 0x05, 0x06, 0x07, 0x08, 0x09, 0x0a,  
                                       0x0b, 0x0c, 0x0d, 0x0e, 0x0f, 0x10, 0x11, 0x12, 0x13, 0x14,  
/*CRC*/                               0xe3, 0x94}}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */  
  
unsigned char crc16[] = {0xC0, 0xFC, 0xDA, 0x37}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */  
unsigned char crc16A[] = {0x80, 0xCE, 0xC1, 0xEA}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
```



```
unsigned char crc16B[] = {0x80, 0xFC, 0xD7, 0xFB}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
```

```
unsigned char crc16C[] = {0xC0, 0xCE, 0xCC, 0x26}; /* last two bytes are CRC in big endian format */
```

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5693**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	999	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.1.3
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	---------	------------

In the latest draft of the 802.16e specification the text in section 6.3.21.1.3 Association Procedure has been significantly revised and new types of Association have been added. While the new procedures are definitely useful and provide for an increased level of flexibility, some parts of the newly introduced text are ambiguous and need further clarification.

In the following we mention the ambiguities in the text for each section.

It is mentioned in the beginning of section 6.3.21.3.2 "Association Level 1 - Association with coordination" that "The MS may request to perform association with coordination by sending the MOB\_SCN-REQ message to the Serving BS with ASSOCIATION\_TYPE = 0b001. This message will include a list of neighboring BS's with which the MS wishes to perform association." Also, in the beginning of section 6.3.21.3.3 "Association Level 2 - NW Assisted Association Reporting" specifies that "The MS may request to perform association with NW assisted association reporting by sending the MOB\_SCN-REQ message to the Serving BS with ASSOCIATION TYPE = 0b010. This message will include a list of neighboring BSs with which the MS wishes to perform association."

The wording in both sited sections suggests that association of the corresponding level (level 1 or 2) can only be requested by the MS, and cannot be initiated by the BS. It should be possible for the BS to send an unsolicited MOB\_SCN\_RSP message in which ASSOCIATION\_TYPE = 0b001 or 0b010 is indicated, without having received an explicit request from the MS.

Furthermore, for both association levels 1 and 2, it is specified that the each neighboring BS (with which the MS will be associating) provides the following parameters to assist the association process:

- A "rendezvous time"
- a unique code number (from within the initial ranging code-set?)
- a transmission opportunity within the allocated region (in terms of offset from the start of the region)

What is not clear from the provided description is the following:

- The provided "rendezvous time" is in units of frames, and refers to the frame in which the neighboring BS will start assigning a ranging region with "Dedicated Ranging Indicator" bit set to 1, in which the MS can use the dedicated CDMA code that it has been assigned. The fact that the "rendezvous time" is specified in number of frames implies that the serving BS and the neighbor BS have synchronized frame structures. If that is not the case then the rendezvous time cannot be determined in terms of number of frames since the MS has to spend an unspecified amount of time when switching from one BS to the other. What is also not clear, is if the "rendezvous time" specifies the first frame in which the dedicated ranging region will appear and where the MS can use the dedicated CDMA code, or if it points at the frame in which the UL\_MAP describing the dedicated ranging region will appear (which is at least one frame before the frame in which the region appears, depending on the value of the resource allocation start time).
- The transmission opportunity is defined as an offset from the start of the dedicated ranging region in the neighboring BS. However, the MS can only learn the location of the dedicated ranging region in the neighboring BS by reading the UL\_MAP of that BS.

#### Suggested Remedy

Adopt remedy in contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/290

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt Contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/290r1 with the following changes:

Under 6.3.21.1.3.2 Association Level 1 - Association with coordination, change the second paragraph as indicated:

Under 6.3.21.1.3.2 Association Level 1 - Association with coordination, change the second paragraph as indicated.

The serving BS may also arrange for this type of association unilaterally, i.e., ~~without an explicit request from the MS~~ by sending unsolicited MOB\_SCN-RSP

Under the "Rendezvous time" bullet, remove the last sentence (indicated here):

~~For the calculation of "rendezvous time" the MS shall assume that the serving BS and the neighbor BS, to which "rendezvous time" refers, have synchronized frame structures.~~

On the next bullet, change as indicated, from:

- The MS should synchronize to the neighbor BS at the frame indicated by "rendezvous time"

to:

- The MS **shall** synchronize to the neighbor BS at the **first frame immediately following the** "rendezvous time"

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Adopt Contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/290r1 with the following changes:

Under 6.3.21.1.3.2 Association Level 1 - Association with coordination, change the second paragraph as indicated:

The serving BS may also arrange for this type of association unilaterally, i.e., ~~without an explicit request from the MS~~ by sending unsolicited MOB\_SCN-RSP

Under the "Rendezvous time" bullet, remove the last sentence (indicated here):

~~For the calculation of "rendezvous time" the MS shall assume that the serving BS and the neighbor BS, to which "rendezvous time" refers, have synchronized frame structures.~~

On the next bullet, change as indicated, from:

- The MS should synchronize to the neighbor BS at the frame indicated by "rendezvous time"

to:

- The MS **shall** synchronize to the neighbor BS at the **first frame immediately following the** "rendezvous time"

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

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

#### Editor's Notes

**Editor's Actions** k) done

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

#### Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5694**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Cudak

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	999	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.21.2
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	---------	----------

The handover description section (section 6.3.21.2) has been drastically revised in D8. While many issues have been clarified, some parts of this section still remain ambiguous and need further clarification.

More specifically, in this contribution we address the following issues:

In the beginning of section 6.3.21.2.2 ("HO decision and initiation") the description about how a handover is initiated, what messages are exchanged and which are optional and which are mandatory is rather vague. New text is introduced to spell out the messages that may be exchanged depending on which side initiates the handover, and what messages should be generated as a response. (lines 6-9, 12-18)

In the last paragraph of section 6.3.21.2.2 ("HO decision and initiation") the statement about when the MS is released from the obligation to monitor DL traffic from the BS is ambiguous. The reference to the Resource Retain Timer is irrelevant. It is mentioned that the MS is not required to monitor any DL traffic after sending the MOB\_HO\_IND. New text is introduced to define when the BS should stop sending DL traffic to the MS prior to a HO. More specifically, since MOB\_HO\_IND can be a response to either MOB\_BSHO\_REQ or MOB\_BSHO\_RSP the BS should stop addressing any DL traffic to the MS when it sends either message. In the case that MOB\_HO\_IND is sent unsolicited (without any prior HO preparation/negotiation with the serving BS through MOB\_BSHO\_REQ/RSP) the BS can only (and should) stop sending DL traffic to the MS when it receives the MOB\_HO\_IND message. (lines 60-62)

The text in the beginning of the third and last paragraph of section 6.3.21.2.5 ("Termination with the serving BS") is both ambiguous and redundant. In particular, while the information is retained at the serving BS, it is stated that "this connection information can be used by the MS in order to perform expedited re-entry operation with target BS or the serving BS". (lines 45-48)

This statement is ambiguous and redundant for the following reasons:

==> The BS can decide to retain connection information and it indicates this through the Resource Retain Indication. This has been described in earlier parts of the text and need not be repeated here

==> At the opposite side, the MS will decide to retain its connection information and use it when connecting with the target BS based on what is indicated in HO Process Optimization and NOT based on the decision of the serving BS to retain the connection information (i.e. NOT based on the Resource Retain timer). This is also described in other parts of the text and needs not be repeated here.

==> The only case where connection information retention at the MS and at the serving BS side are related is when the MS decides to come back to the serving BS. This has also been described in earlier sections and need not be repeated here.

#### Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/292

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt contribution IEEE C802.16e-05/292r1.

#### Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

D8 provides sufficient guidelines for handover operation of MS and BS. On the contrary, the proposed procedure breaks the handshaking of HO management messages which is already clarified in D8 and raises implementation issues.

Suggested remedy contains the following paragraph that deviates very significantly from common understanding of HO state machine, for example, looks like MS may START from MOB\_HO-IND message that never was considered by contributors to HO section.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5695**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	vario	Starting Line #	vario	Fig/Table#	Section	various
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-------	-----------------	-------	------------	---------	---------

I am continuing to find commands in MSCs that don't exist elsewhere.

**Suggested Remedy**

Review each MSC and figure to verify that every command referenced in figure is the correct name for it. If the names don't match, the standard is broken.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Rejected**

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

Lack of specific text.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5696**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	vario	Starting Line #	vario	Fig/Table#	Section	various
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-------	-----------------	-------	------------	---------	---------

The table heading needs to repeat across pages at the top of each continuation of the table and the table title should include one of "continuation", "cont." or a suitable notation. Tables 298r and 298t are examples of this.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change as indicated here and throughout the draft. This is a repeat of my earlier comment, which apparently did not get applied to the entire draft as I have found at least two table that violate this requirement. This time, check the entire draft for this mistake and correct it.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change as indicated here and throughout the draft. This is a repeat of my earlier comment, which apparently did not get applied to the entire draft as I have found at least two table that violate this requirement. This time, check the entire draft for this mistake and correct it.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

This is not a technical comment; this is editorial. The tight schedule for this re-circ does not permit me the luxury of tweaking cosmetic changes to tables. The IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual section 5.4.3.2 (Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes) reads: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5697**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding** Starting Page # **all** Starting Line # **vario** Fig/Table# Section **various**

The tables lack a uniform application of borders. It is both distracting and unprofessional. The first draft to ballot might have some of these, but a recirculation should not have the level of editorial mistakes that is present in this draft.

**Suggested Remedy**

Fix all of the table to use the correct borders as per the 2005 IEEE Style Guide.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

The task group's primary concern is technical content. Cosmetic editorial changes can and will be dealt with during the final IEEE editing and publication process.

**Group's Notes**

Group's Action Items

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5698**

Comment submitted by: Haixiang

He

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #

Security Association scope should be clear.

Fig/Table# Section **7.2.3.3.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Add to the end of section 7.2.3.3.1

A security association is shared between a MS and a BS or a set of BSes.

**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by**

Add to the end of section 7.2.2.3.1

A security association is shared between a MS and a BS or, in case of ongoing SHO(FBSS) between MS and BSs from Active Set.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Add to the end of section 7.2.2.3.1

A security association is shared between a MS and a BS or, in case of ongoing SHO(FBSS) between MS and BSs from Active Set.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5699**

Comment submitted by: **Jeff**

**Mandin**

**Member**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type <b>Editorial</b>	Starting Page # <b>999</b>	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	------------	---------

There is still some "OMAC" scattered around D8

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace every instance of OMAC with CMAC

Replace every instance of OMAC\_\* with CMAC\_\*

**Proposed Resolution**      **Recommendation:**      **Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**      **Decision of Group: **Accepted****

Replace every instance of OMAC with CMAC

Replace every instance of OMAC\_\* with CMAC\_\*

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**      **Editor's Actions**    k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5700**

Comment submitted by: Greg

Phillips

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	Gen	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	---------

In light of the report from the IETF on the security review of IEEE 802.16e D8. I cast a disapprove ballot.

If we knowingly allow the adoption of this standard after a report showing that the security of data transferred under the 802.16 standard can be compromised we can expect significant resistance from the market in adopting this technology.

One section of the specific text from the report that highlights these concerns is:

"Overall, significant issues were found in the usage of EAP by 802.16e. Issues were found with IEEE 802.16e compatibility with RFC 3748, the EAP Key Management Framework as well as AAA Key Management Requirements. Several of the issues discovered are considered "critical" in that if they are not repaired, IEEE 802.16e will provide little in the way of guaranteed security."

Their are many other items presented in addition to those relating to interoperability of AAA servers and failings of the current document.

I strongly make note that the work undertaken in this review process should not be ignored. These are very serious considerations that have been raised in the past and now we have highly qualified team describe them in sufficient detail for us not to ignore.

#### Suggested Remedy

Due to the late nature of this report sufficient time to draft a total remedy is not available. I suggest that the remedy process be undertaken as outlined in the report.

The review is available at <http://www.drizzle.com/~aboba/EAP/review.txt>.

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation: **Superceded**      Recommendation by

#### Reason for Recommendation

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Resolution of Group      Decision of Group: **Superceded**

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

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

#### Group's Notes

#### Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    l) none needed

No action required for this comment.

#### Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5701**

Comment submitted by: **John T.**

**Scott**

**Other**

**2005/06/08**

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Gen	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	---------

This document meets SCC14 standards.

Suggested Remedy

None needed

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

None needed.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5702**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**1.4.3.1.1**

Incorrect grammar

Suggested Remedy

Change "MS" to "MSs" in the 1st paragraph, 1st sentence

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change "MS" to "MSs" in the 1st paragraph, 1st sentence

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5703**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**1.4.3.1.1**

Incorrect grammar

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete the word "responsible" iin the 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Delete the word "responsible" iin the 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** c) instructions unclear

No page or line numbers given; there is no subclause 1.4.3.1.1.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5704**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**Table 1b**

**Incorrect grammar**

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert "the" before "control plane" in the title of the table

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Insert "the" before "control plane" in the title of the table

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5705**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **2**

Incomplete references

**Suggested Remedy**

Include the RFC title and authors in the reference list

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

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

No text provided.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5706**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **3.71**

[Awkward definition](#)

**Suggested Remedy**

[Delete the first sentence. Insert "The Active Set is applicable to SHO and FBSS." at the end of the definition](#)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: [Superseded](#)**

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

[See comment 5004.](#)

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [1\) none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5707**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**3.73**

[Incorrect grammar](#)

**Suggested Remedy**

[Change "synchronized with" to "synchronized" and change "ranging with" to "ranging"](#)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superseded****

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

[See comment 5004.](#)

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [1\) none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5708**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **3.75**

[Incorrect grammar](#)

**Suggested Remedy**

[Insert "the" or "a" before fast switching mechanism.](#)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: [Superseded](#)**

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

[See comment 5004.](#)

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [1\) none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5709**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #  
Incorrect definition; the definition describes a function, "encrypted by", rather than an entity, "a key"

Fig/Table# Section **3.78**

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace with "The GKEK is a random number used to encrypt the GTEKs sent in multicast messages by the BS to the MSs in the same multicast group." or similar.

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superseded****

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

**See comment 5004.**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5710**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #  
Conflicting definitions - the definition of "MS" in 3.80 is different than that in Clause 1.4.3.1

Fig/Table# Section **3.8**

Suggested Remedy

Make the definition of "MS" in 3.80 the same as that in Clause 1.4.3.1

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 5004.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5711**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **3.8.1**

Inconsistent definition

Suggested Remedy

Change "Orderly" to "orderly" to be consistent with the other definitions

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 5004.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5712**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **4**

SSID Acronym doesn't match definition

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "SSID" to "SSMAC" or similar, to have a more intuitive acronym. Also, Page 58 uses "MS MAC Address" Are these the same?

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

In clause 4, change SSID entry to the following:  
SSID subscriber station identification (MAC address)

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

In clause 4, change SSID entry to the following:  
SSID subscriber station identification (MAC address)

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

An SS and an MS are not necessarily the same device. Therefore, an SS MAC address and an MS MAC address are not the same thing.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5713**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding** Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #  
Incorrect grammar

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.1.2**

**Suggested Remedy**

In second sentence, change "is illustrated" to "are illustrated"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

In second sentence, change "is illustrated" to "are illustrated"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** e) editor disagrees

"The MAC signaling header type I is illustrated in Figure 19a." is correct.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5714**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Editorial, Binding	Starting Page #	999	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	6.3.2.1.2.1.1
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	---------	---------------

Text does not specify a requirement. Multiple instances of this.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "This is a MAC signalling header type 1" to "The MAC signalling Type Header shall be "1"

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation: <b>Accepted-Modified</b>	Recommendation by
---------------------	--	-------------------

Change "This is a MAC signalling header type 1" to "It is a MAC signaling header Type 1"

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Change "This is a MAC signalling header type 1" to "It is a MAC signaling header Type 1"

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5715**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.1.2.2.3**

Incorrect grammar

**Suggested Remedy**

Insert "The" at the beginning of the first sentence, and change "Class" to "Classes"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Insert "The" at the beginning of the first sentence, and change "Class" to "Classes"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** c) instructions unclear

No page or line number given, and 6.3.2.1.2.2.3 does not exist.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5716**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**  
Reference Figures and Include Tables are missing

Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #

Fig/Table# Section **6.3.2.1.2.2.4**

Suggested Remedy  
Add the missing items

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution  
This table exists in the delta document only. It is not in the draft under recirculation.

Group's Notes  
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5717**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.1.2.4**

Incorrect grammar

**Suggested Remedy**

Just prior to table 7m, change "The support of feedback header" to ""Support of the Feedback header"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Just prior to table 7m, change "The support of feedback header" to ""Support of the Feedback header"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** g) didn't have time

Due to time constraints, this editorial comment was not completed.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5718**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**Table 7m**

Is a value of 1 valid for the N/M flag?

Suggested Remedy

Specify

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

No table 7m exists in D8 draft

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

No table 7m exists in D8 draft

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5719**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Incorrect Title	Editorial, Binding	999			Table 7q

**Suggested Remedy**

Title should be "MIMO Channel Feedback Header" or "Mini-Feedback header"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Rejected**

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

Commenter is using numbering in the D8delta, so a little confusing to find where commenter is referring to. The commenter seems to be referring to language in 6.3.2.1.2.3.1 MIMO Channel Feedback header, Table 7j—Description of MIMO Channel Feedback header fields in the D8 document. The title, 'Table 7j—Description of MIMO Channel Feedback header fields', already incorporates the degree of descriptiveness the commenter seeks.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5720**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.2.8.1**

[Incorrect grammar](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Delete the "" in the first sentence](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[Delete the "" in the first sentence](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [c\) instructions unclear](#)

[No page or line number given, and 6.3.2.2.8.1 does not exist.](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5721**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment

Type **Technical, Binding**Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

**6.3.2.2.9.1**

Incorrect meaning, grammar

**Suggested Remedy**

Something is wrong with this sentence, but I'm not sure what. Should "carriers" be "carries"?

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by

[In 6.3.2.2.7.5 UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader, page 40, line 4, modify as:]

'This subheader is sent from MS to BS to report the Tx power of the burst that carriers this subheader. ~~The format of the UL is~~'**Reason for Recommendation**

Commenter is using numbering in the D8delta, so a little confusing to find where commenter is referring to. Commenter appears to be referring to language in 6.3.2.2.9.2 of the D8delta document which is 6.3.2.2.7.5 UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader in the D8 document.

**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[In 6.3.2.2.7.5 UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader, page 40, line 4, modify as:]

'This subheader is sent from MS to BS to report the Tx power of the burst that carriers this subheader. ~~The format of the UL is~~'**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Commenter is using numbering in the D8delta, so a little confusing to find where commenter is referring to. Commenter appears to be referring to language in 6.3.2.2.9.2 of the D8delta document which is 6.3.2.2.7.5 UL Tx Power Report Extended Subheader in the D8 document.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**



2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5722**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #  
Unclear specification. "Once per protocol run". Which protocol? PKM? EAP?

Fig/Table# Section **Table 33**

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Superceded** Recommendation by  
[See comment #5133](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution  
[See comment #5133](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions  none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5723**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **Table 37a**

Just below the table, the text references "MSm X509 Cert. The next paragraph references the SS's private key. Does SS=MS here?"

**Suggested Remedy**

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

[In 6.3.2.3.9.11 PKMv2 RSA-Request message, page 50, line 61, modify as:]

'The SigSS indicates an RSA signature over all the other attributes in this message, and the ~~SM~~S's private key is used to make an RSA signature.'

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

[In 6.3.2.3.9.11 PKMv2 RSA-Request message, page 50, line 61, modify as:]

'The SigSS indicates an RSA signature over all the other attributes in this message, and the ~~SM~~S's private key is used to make an RSA signature.'

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5724**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	999	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	General
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	---------	---------

I agree with the commenter of Comment 4385 and 4384. The MS/SS language MUST be cleaned up and consistent, as is required for an amendment (.16e) to a base standard (.16).

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace all instances of "MS" with "SS" and amend the definition of SS to include the ability to be mobile.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by**

*see resolution of comments 5004, 5008, 5028, 5029, 5032, 5037, 5101, 5104, 5117, 5119, 5150, 5153, 5154, 5155, 5220, 5226, 5472, 5710, 5733*

**Reason for Recommendation**

Such change, applied to the current text, would harm backward compatibility requested by 802.16e PAR which does not allow to introduce new features that were not requested by 802.16-2004 unless applicability of such features is limited to mobile systems. For example, 802.16-2004 does not contain definition of SN report feature [used in HO]. This is why in 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 "SN report header" the terminal is called MS, not SS:

"The SN report header is sent by the **MS** to report the the LSB of the next ARQ BSN or the virtual MAC SDU Sequence number for the active connections with SN Feedback enabled."

**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Superseded****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

*see resolution of comments 5004, 5008, 5028, 5029, 5032, 5037, 5101, 5104, 5117, 5119, 5150, 5153, 5154, 5155, 5220, 5226, 5472, 5710, 5733*

*Such change, applied to the current text, would harm backward compatibility requested by 802.16e PAR which does not allow to introduce new features that were not requested by 802.16-2004 unless applicability of such features is limited to mobile systems. For example, 802.16-2004 does not contain definition of SN report feature [used in HO]. This is why in 6.3.2.1.2.1.7 "SN report header" the terminal is called MS, not SS:*

*"The SN report header is sent by the **MS** to report the the LSB of the next ARQ BSN or the virtual MAC SDU Sequence number for the active connections with SN Feedback enabled."*

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** (none needed)

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    [1\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5725**

Comment submitted by: [Dorothy](#)

[Stanley](#)

[Member](#)

[2005/06/08](#)

Comment      Type [Technical, Binding](#)

Starting Page # [999](#)      Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

[Table 26](#)

[Duplicate EAP-Start](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Delete type 29, same as type 17.](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: [Superceded](#)

Recommendation by

[See comment #5115](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: [Superceded](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[See comment #5115](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions    [1\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5726**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #

Errors in EAP usage identified in IETF review

Fig/Table# Section **6.3**

**Suggested Remedy**

Address the issues identified in <http://www.drizzle.com/~aboba/EAP/review.txt>

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

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

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5727**Comment submitted by: **Wen****Tong**

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #  
 2ms frame OFDMA PHY is missing (it is in IEEE802.16-2004)

Fig/Table# **358a** Section **11.4.1****Suggested Remedy**

insert --&gt; 0b0000 = 2.0ms

## Change:

0b0001 = 2.5 ms

0b0010 = 4ms

0b0011 = 5 ms

0b0100 = 8 ms

0b0101 = 10 ms

0b0110 = 12.5 ms

0b0111 = 20ms

0b1000 ~ 0b1111= reserved

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

*editor's instructions: Change table 358a in section 11.4.1 as follows**insert --> 0b0000 = 2.0ms**Change:**0b0001 = 2.5 ms**0b0010 = 4ms**0b0011 = 5 ms**0b0100 = 8 ms**0b0101 = 10 ms**0b0110 = 12.5 ms**0b0111 = 20ms**0b1000 ~ 0b1111= reserved**editor's instructions: Change tables 384a and 384b in section 11.19.1 as follows:**insert --> 0b0000 = 2.0ms**Change:**0b0001 = 2.5 ms**0b0010 = 4ms**0b0011 = 5 ms**0b0100 = 8 ms**0b0101 = 10 ms*

~~~~~ = ~~~~~  
0b0110 = 12.5 ms  
0b0111 = 20ms  
0b1000 ~ 0b1111= reserved

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

*editor's instructions: Change table 358a in section 11.4.1 as follows*

*insert --> 0b0000 = 2.0ms*

*Change:*  
0b0001 = 2.5 ms  
0b0010 = 4ms  
0b0011 = 5 ms  
0b0100 = 8 ms  
0b0101 = 10 ms  
0b0110 = 12.5 ms  
0b0111 = 20ms  
0b1000 ~ 0b1111= reserved

*editor's instructions: Change tables 384a and 384b in section 11.19.1 as follows:*

*insert --> 0b0000 = 2.0ms*

*Change:*  
0b0001 = 2.5 ms  
0b0010 = 4ms  
0b0011 = 5 ms  
0b0100 = 8 ms  
0b0101 = 10 ms  
0b0110 = 12.5 ms  
0b0111 = 20ms  
0b1000 ~ 0b1111= reserved

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

Table 358a no longer contained the data. The second table was changed

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Table 358a no longer contained the data. The second table was changed.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5728**

Comment submitted by: Michelle

Turner

Other

2005/06/08

| Comment                                                                                               | Type | Starting Page # | gen | Starting Line # | Fig/Table# | Section |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|------------|---------|
| Separate electronic files of figures shall be supplied in TIFF format (unless created in FrameMaker). |      |                 |     |                 |            |         |

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

No action required. All figures are in FrameMaker format.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5729**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

|               |      |                        |                 |     |                 |            |         |
|---------------|------|------------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|------------|---------|
| Comment       | Type | Technical, Non-binding | Starting Page # | 999 | Starting Line # | Fig/Table# | Section |
| Actually typo |      |                        |                 |     |                 |            |         |

Suggested Remedy  
Change

11.7.26 HO header support

to

11.7.26 Header support

Proposed Resolution      Recommendation:      Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group      Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

*see resolution of comment 5052*

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes      Editor's Actions    *l) none needed*

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5730**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

| Comment | Type | Technical, Non-binding | Starting Page # | 999 | Starting Line # | Fig/Table# | Section |
|---------|------|------------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|------------|---------|
|---------|------|------------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|------------|---------|

According to Table 5, ESF = Extended Subheader Field is a name of bit in the header. This bit marks presence of Extended Subheader. But in several cases in the text "ESF" is used as abbreviation for Extended Subheader itself.

**Suggested Remedy**

## Change

Extended Subheader Field. If ESF = 0, the **extended subheader** ~~ESF~~ is absent. If ESF=1, the ~~ESF~~ **extended subheader** is present and will follow the GMH immediately. (See 6.3.2.2.7). The ESF is applicable both in the DL and in the UL.

Change at p.14 line 57

The ESF bit in the Generic MAC header indicates that the Extended Subheader ~~field~~ is present. Using this field, a number of additional subheaders can be used within a PDU. The **extended subheader** ~~ESF~~ field shall always appear immediately after the Generic MAC header and before all other subheaders. ~~ESF field and all extended subheaders related to it~~ are not encrypted. (See 6.3.2.2.7)

Change at p.35 line 1

If the Mesh subheader is indicated, it shall precede all other subheaders except for the **extended subheader** ~~ESF~~. In the downlink, the Fast-feedback allocation subheader shall always appear as the last per-PDU subheader. The ESF bit in the GMH Generic MAC Header indicates that the Extended Subheader ~~Field~~ is present. Using this field, a number of additional subheaders can be used within a PDU. The **extended subheader** ~~ESF~~ field shall always appear immediately after the GMH, and before all other subheaders. ~~The ESF field and all extended subheaders related to it~~ are not encrypted. (See 6.3.2.2.7)

Change at p.36, line 40

~~The ESF and all extended subheaders associated to it~~ are transmitted sequentially.

Change at p.37, line 7

Table 13a—Extended subheader format (~~ESF~~)

## Change

Extended Subheader Field. If ESF = 0, the ~~extended subheader~~ **ESF** is absent. If ESF=1, the ~~ESF~~ **extended subheader** is present and will follow the GMH immediately. (See 6.3.2.2.7). The ESF is applicable both in the DL and in the UL.

Change at p.14 line 57

The ESF bit in the Generic MAC header indicates that the Extended Subheader ~~field~~ is present. Using this field, a number of additional subheaders can be used within a PDU. The ~~extended subheader~~ **ESF field** shall always appear immediately after the Generic MAC header and before all other subheaders. ~~ESF field and a~~ **All** extended subheaders ~~related to it~~ are not encrypted. (See 6.3.2.2.7)

Change at p.35 line 1

If the Mesh subheader is indicated, it shall precede all other subheaders except for the ~~extended subheader~~ **ESF**. In the downlink, the Fast-feedback allocation subheader shall always appear as the last per-PDU subheader. The ESF bit in the GMH Generic MAC Header indicates that the Extended Subheader ~~Field~~ is present. Using this field, a number of additional subheaders can be used within a PDU. The ~~extended subheader~~ **ESF field** shall always appear immediately after the GMH, and before all other subheaders. ~~The ESF field and a~~ **All** extended subheaders ~~related to it~~ are not encrypted. (See 6.3.2.2.7)

Change at p.36, line 40

~~The ESF and a~~ **All** extended subheaders ~~associated to it~~ are transmitted sequentially.

Change at p.37, line 7

Table 13a—Extended subheader format (~~ESF~~)

## Reason for Recommendation

## Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

## Change

Extended Subheader Field. If ESF = 0, the ~~extended subheader~~ **ESF** is absent. If ESF=1, the ~~ESF~~ **extended subheader** is present and will follow the GMH immediately. (See 6.3.2.2.7). The ESF is applicable both in the DL and in the UL.

Change at p.14 line 57

The ESF bit in the Generic MAC header indicates that the Extended Subheader ~~field~~ is present. Using this field, a number of additional subheaders can be used within a PDU. The ~~extended subheader~~ **ESF field** shall always appear immediately after the Generic MAC header and before all other subheaders. ~~ESF field and a~~ **All** extended subheaders ~~related to it~~ are not encrypted. (See 6.3.2.2.7)

Change at p.35 line 1

If the Mesh subheader is indicated, it shall precede all other subheaders except for the ~~extended subheader~~ **ESF**. In the downlink, the Fast-feedback allocation subheader shall always appear as the last per-PDU subheader. The ESF bit in the GMH Generic MAC Header indicates that the Extended Subheader ~~Field~~ is present. Using this field, a number of additional subheaders can be used within a PDU. The ~~extended subheader~~ **ESF field** shall always appear immediately after the GMH, and before all other subheaders. ~~The ESF field and a~~ **All** extended

subheaders related to it are not encrypted. (See 6.3.2.2.7)

Change at p.36, line 40

~~The ESF and a~~All extended subheaders associated to it are transmitted sequentially.

Change at p.37, line 7

Table 13a—Extended subheader format (~~ESF~~)

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

Could not find "~~The ESF and a~~All extended subheaders associated to it are transmitted sequentially." Removed?

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5731**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **999** Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

Name of the message "MOB\_SCAN-REPORT" does not follow 802.16e conventions

**Suggested Remedy**

Change throughout the document "MOB\_SCAN-REPORT" to "MOB\_SCN-REP"

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Change throughout the document "MOB\_SCAN-REPORT" to "MOB\_SCN-REP"

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5732**

Comment submitted by: Vladimir

Yanover

Member

2005/06/08

|           |      |           |                 |     |                 |            |         |
|-----------|------|-----------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|------------|---------|
| Comment   | Type | Editorial | Starting Page # | 999 | Starting Line # | Fig/Table# | Section |
| Editorial |      |           |                 |     |                 |            |         |

**Suggested Remedy**

Change throughout the document RNG\_REQ to RNG-REQ

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change throughout the document RNG\_REQ to RNG-REQ

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5733**

Comment submitted by: Jonathan

Labs

Member

2005/06/08

| Comment | Type | Technical, Binding | Starting Page # | 999 | Starting Line # | 1 | Fig/Table# | Section |
|---------|------|--------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|---|------------|---------|
|---------|------|--------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|---|------------|---------|

I object to the resolutions of comments 3034, 3233, 3269, 3474 and 3480 in IEEE 802.16-05/019 (or database IEEE 802.16-05/12r3) and comment 4384 in IEEE 802.16-05/23r5. All these comments address the improper usage of SS versus MS versus FSS. The resolution of the group was: "Change all SS to MS in 802.16e draft for new text or modified text; do not change SS in unmodified/duplicated instances. Delete the definition of FS" for the first set of comments from 05/12r3. For comment 4384, there was not even a reason given for rejection!

I feel this is a major problem with the ammendment and it is not being corrected by the group. Here is one example of the problem: if one looks at the text changes in 6.3.2.3.26 De/Re-register command (DREG-CMD) message, specifically at Table 55--Action codes and actions. All action codes are now defined for MSs, not SSs. This tells me that there are now no action codes for a fixed SS.

In my mind an SS can be either a mobile SS or a fixed SS. MS is only a mobile SS.

I provided an extensive list of modifications in a previous recirc ballot to clean this problem up, but I do not believe they were considered by the Ballot resolution committee. I will not provide "specific text" again, only to have it ignored. Phil Barber also submitted a contribution at the meeting in Sorrento to try to clean up the problem for the MAC section but not part of it was accepted.

This problem will become very apparent when this ammendment is eventually integrated with 802.16-2004 to form a new revision.

#### Suggested Remedy

Fix up the usage of MS versus SS, such that the text does not break the operation of fixed systems. Phil Barber made some concerted effort at Session 37 in Sorrento to fix the problem in the MAC section (refer to comment 4001), but the entire contribution was rejected by the group. I would recommend reviewing it again, as well as comments 3034, 3233, 3269, 3474 and 3480 in IEEE 802.16-05/019.

| Proposed Resolution | Recommendation: | Recommendation by |
|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|

| Reason for Recommendation |
|---------------------------|
|---------------------------|

| Resolution of Group | Decision of Group: <b>Superceded</b> |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|

| Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution |
|----------------------------------------|
|----------------------------------------|

See comment 5724.

| Group's Notes |
|---------------|
|---------------|

| Group's Action Items |
|----------------------|
|----------------------|

| Editor's Notes | Editor's Actions |
|----------------|------------------|
|----------------|------------------|

l) none needed

| Editor's Questions and Concerns |
|---------------------------------|
|---------------------------------|

**2005/06/27**

**IEEE 802.16-05/035r4**

**Editor's Action Items**



Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5734L**

Comment submitted by: Yongseok

Jin

Other

2005/06/09

| Comment | Type                   | Starting Page # | Starting Line # | Fig/Table# | Section |
|---------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|---------|
|         | Technical, Non-binding |                 |                 |            | 8.4.5.5 |

I object to the implementation in the draft of Comment #4280 because there is not enough DIUC/UIUC's.

The current specification includes several FEC types such as CC(mandatory), BTC(optional), CTC(optional), ZT CC(optional) and LDPC(optional), and defines 41 burst profiles e.g., QPSK(CC) 1/2, 16QAM(CTC) 2/3 and so on (see Table 361) where each FEC type has about 6~15 burst profiles. BS selects and allocates 13 burst profiles among 41 burst profiles onto DIUC0 through DIUC12 and 10 burst profiles onto UIUC1~UIUC10, and announce it through the DCD/UCD messages. When the cell includes MS's having different FEC types, DIUC0~DIUC12 should support these FEC types and it makes one FEC type get small room of MCS levels. For example, when three MS's within a cell have CC+CTC, CC+LDPC and CC+BTC respectively, each FEC type (CC, CTC, LDPC and BTC) should have only 3~4 DIUC's and 2~3 UIUC's. These numbers of DIUC/UIUC's are too small for fine link adaptation.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt C80216e-05\_234r2 "DIUC/UIUC provision for supporting multiple advanced FEC types"

**Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Adopt C802.16e-05/234r4 with the following modifications:

*[Change the sentence indicated from the first paragraph as shown:]*

Table 301a defines the format of the Downlink\_Burst\_Profile with type=153, which is used in the DCD message (6.3.2.3.1) for MS only.

*[Change the sentence indicated from the second paragraph as shown:]*

Table 302a defines the format of the Uplink\_Burst\_Profile with type=13, which is used in the UCD message (6.3.2.3.3) for MS only.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Contribution is incomplete.

**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5735L**

Comment submitted by: Yongseok

Jin

Other

2005/06/09

|         |      |                        |                 |    |                 |            |         |           |
|---------|------|------------------------|-----------------|----|-----------------|------------|---------|-----------|
| Comment | Type | Technical, Non-binding | Starting Page # | 36 | Starting Line # | Fig/Table# | Section | 6.3.2.2.7 |
|---------|------|------------------------|-----------------|----|-----------------|------------|---------|-----------|

I object to the resolution of Comment #4040 because the latest harmonized version of the proposed contribution is 236r1, not 236r0. Therefore, we propose to adopt the proposed text in IEEE C802.16e-05/236r1.

**Suggested Remedy**

Adopt the proposed text change in IEEE C80216e-05/236r1 "Clarification of MAC Extended Subheader".

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Unresolved**

Due to time constraints, this late comment was not addressed by the group.

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

2005/06/27

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5736L**

Comment submitted by: Yongseok

Jin

Other

2005/06/09

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **347** Starting Line # **1**  
CQICH Enhanced Allocation IE Format was defined as section 8.4.5.4.15. not section 8.4.5.4.11.1.

Fig/Table# Section **8.4.5.4.11.1**

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove the section 8.4.5.4.11.1 CQICH Enhanced Allocation IE Format.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Unresolved**

Due to time constraints, this late comment was not addressed by the group.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions **) none needed**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5737L**

Comment submitted by: Yongseok

Jin

Other

2005/06/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **378** Starting Line # **30**

Fig/Table# **302x** Section **8.4.5.4.29**

The field name, Allocation offset, differs from the mentioned name in the 302x table.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace Allocation offset with Frame offset.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Unresolved**

Due to time constraints, this late comment was not addressed by the group.

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

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5738L**

Comment submitted by: **Jungnam**

**Yun**

**Other**

**2005/06/09**

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **399** Starting Line # **26** Fig/Table# Section **8.4.6.1.2.1**

UL PUSC Subcarrier Allocation is not well described for different FFT sizes. In current form, only one example for 2048 FFT size is available.

**Suggested Remedy**

[adopt contribution C80216e-05\\_304.doc](#)

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation:**

**Recommendation by**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: **Superseded****

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

[See comment 5552.](#)

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** [1\) none needed](#)

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5739L**

Comment submitted by: Kiseon

Ryu

Other

2005/06/09

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **508** Starting Line # **58** Fig/Table# **353a** Section **11.3.1**

I object to the resolution of Comment #4333 because the reduction of broadcast message size is important for the usage of bandwidth more efficiently. If a BS omits UL-MAP IE with UIUC 12 in UL-MAP and MS is informed of allocated ranging region, it can reduce the broadcast message overhead.

At the last session, the r2 version was presented but rejected. There were 3 reasons for rejection.

The first reason was that there was not enough time for all members to review the contribution carefully because much time was spent in harmonizing.

The second rejection reason was that this feature should be optional for MS.

And the third reason was that we should use only MAPs for allocations.

We have modified the contribution to solve above problems.

To solve the second problem, we added the red and underlined text to make this feature optional for MS.

We cannot accept the third reason because D8 already describes DCD parameter for MAP information, which is "DL region definition".

#### Suggested Remedy

Adopt the contribution C80216e-05\_240r3 (Ranging region allocation using UCD message).

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Unresolved**

Due to time constraints, this late comment was not addressed by the group.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items