

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D5**

Ballot Number: **0000754**

Comment Date

Comment # **1902**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2004-11-04

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **339**

Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table#

Section **E**

This annex has empty subclauses, e.g., E.1.1

Suggested Remedy

Either delete the subclause or provide the missing information for all of the empty subclauses.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This comment was rejected due to the comment's lack of specific text for the empty subclauses, however, it is recognized that such text is needed and it is currently under development by members of the working group.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions i) to do

Remove undefined clauses E.1.1 and E.1.2?

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **802.16e/D9**

Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **1902R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

2004-11-04

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **339**

Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table#

Section **E**

This annex has empty subclauses, e.g. E.1.1

Suggested Remedy

Either delete the subclause or provide the missing information for all of the empty subclauses.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group:

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

This material has now been added.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D5**Ballot Number: **0000754**

Comment Date

Comment # **1874**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2004-11-04

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **332** Starting Line # **vario** Fig/Table# Section **C**

The MSC references 2 commands, I-am-host-of and MSS-info-req, that do not appear in this document or in 802.16-2001, are they defined in 802.16-2004?

Suggested Remedy

If they are not defined in 802.16-2004, these need to be replaced with the actual command name that is passed over the air.

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

These messages are backbone messages which are not passed over the air. Appendix C is purely informative text. It is expected that these messages will be defined further in P802.16g.

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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **1874R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

2004-11-04

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Binding	332			C

The MSC references 2 commands, I-am-host-of and MSS-info-req, that do not appear in this document or in 802.16-2001, are they defined in 802.16-2004?

Suggested Remedy

If they are not defined in 802.16-2004, these need to be replaced with the actual command name that is passed over the air.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group:
---------------------	--------------------

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

A re-work of Annex C removed the commands in question.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D5**

Ballot Number: **0000754**

Comment Date

Comment # **1867**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2004-11-04

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **319** Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section **C**

[Page 319-332; various lines]

The following commands are in the figure, but not the document: HO-notification-*, HO-pre-*. Are they defined in 802.16-2004?

Suggested Remedy

If they are not defined in 802.16-2004, these need to be replaced with the actual command name that is passed over the air.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

These messages are backbone messages which are not passed over the air. Appendix C is purely informative text. It is expected that these messages will be defined further in P802.16g.

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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **1867R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

2004-11-04

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Binding	319			C

[Page 319-332; various lines]

The following commands are in the figure, but not in the document: HO-notification-*, HO-pre*. Are they defined in 802.16-2004?

Suggested Remedy

If they are not defined in 802.16-2004, these need to be replaced with the actual command name that is passed over the air.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group:****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

A re-work of Annex C removed the commands in question.

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

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D5**

Ballot Number: **0000754**

Comment Date

Comment # **1010**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2004-11-04

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **147**

Starting Line # **25**

Fig/Table#

Section

7.8.1.2.2

The cross refernces (See 7.x.x.x) are missing the subclause numbers.

Suggested Remedy

Provide the correct subclause numbers here and throughout the draft, e.g., search for x.x.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Provide the correct subclause numbers here and throughout the draft, e.g., search for x.x.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions c) instructions unclear

Editor's Questions and Concerns

What are the correct subclauses that are supposed to go in here?

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **802.16e/D9**

Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

2004-11-04

Comment # **1010R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **147**

Starting Line # **25**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.8.1.2.2**

The cross references (See 7.x.x.x) are missing in the subclause numbers.

Suggested Remedy

Provide the correct subclause numbers here and throughout the draft, e.g. search for x.x.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of 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/D5**Ballot Number: **0000754**

Comment Date

Comment # **1945**

Comment submitted by: Jonathan

Labs

Member

2004-11-04

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Binding	865	65		

I do not like the way the acronym MSS has been used to replace SS in text that has been pulled from the base document. For example, comparing Table 55--Action Codes and Actions in the P802.16-REVd/D5 (p. 78, line 42) with Table 55a in P802.16e/D5 (p. 29, line 20), one can see that the 'SS' acronym has been replaced by the 'MSS' acronym in the description of the Actions. Such a change tells me that those Action Codes now only apply to mobile SS's and not SS's in general, whether they are fixed or mobile.

(On a side note, the definition of Action Code 0x00 is being redefined in 16e, which I think breaks backward compatibility.)

Suggested Remedy

Throughout the document, use 'SS' when the function can apply to both fixed and mobile SS's and use 'MSS' when the function only applies to mobile SS's.

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

This comment has been superseded by comment #71.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This comment has been superseded by comment #71 which changes the usage of MSS and SS.

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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **1945R**

Comment submitted by: Jonathan

Labs

2004-11-04

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	865	Starting Line #	65	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------

I do not like the way the acronym MSS has been used to replace SS in text that has been pulled from the base document. For example, comparing Table 55--Action Codes and Actions in the P802.16-REVd/D5 (p. 78, line 42) with Table 55a in P802.16e/D5 (p. 29, line 20), one can see that the 'SS' acronym has been replaced by the 'MSS' acronym in the description of the Actions. Such a change tells me that those Action Codes now only apply to mobile SS's and not SS's in general, whether they are fixed or mobile.

(On a side note, the definition of Action Code 0x00 is being redefined in 16e, which I think breaks backward compatibility.)

Suggested Remedy

Throughout the document, use 'SS' when the function can apply to both fixed and mobile SS's and use 'MSS' when the function only applies to mobile SS's.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of 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/D6**Ballot Number: **0001010**

Comment Date

Comment # **3384**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/03/09

Comment Type **Technical, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **319** Starting Line # **vario** Fig/Table# Section **C**
 {pages 319-332:}

"The following commands are in the figure, but not the document: HO-notification-*, HO-pre-*. It is incorrect to justify it by claiming a forward reference to an unpublished draft, i.e., 802.16g."

Suggested Remedy

"Either define the commands or delete them. If the MSCs don't work without them, then delete the MSCs because they can't possibly inform the reader if they use undefined commands"

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by

Remove Figure C6 through Figure C12, Figure C18, Figure C19.

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

Remove Figure C6 through Figure C12, Figure C18, Figure C19.

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

Refer these figures over to 802.16g

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **802.16e/D9**

Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

2005-03-09

Comment # **3384R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Comment Type **Technical, Satisfied (was** Starting Page # **319** Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section **C**

{pages 319-332:}

"The following commands are in the figure, but not the document: HO-notification-*, HO-pre-*. It is incorrect to justify it by claiming a forward reference to an unpublished draft, i.e., 802.16g."

Suggested Remedy

"Either define the commands or delete them. If the MSCs don't work without them, then delete the MSCs because they can't possibly inform the reader if they use undefined commands"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of 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: **0001037**

Comment Date

Comment # **4384**

Comment submitted by: Jonathan

Labs

Member

2005/04/28

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). All these comments address the 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".

I feel this is a quick and not very careful attempt at solving a major problem with the ammendment. Here is just one example where this solution does not solve the problem: Look at page 52, line 19, section 6.3.2.3.23 which is titled in 802.16-2004 "SS Basic Capability Request (SBC-REQ) message", but is now titled in 16e/D7 as "MS basic capability request (SBC-REQ) message". To me this is telling me that with the changes from the amendment, SBC-REQ are now only defined for MS and not fixed SS.

I think it gets worse 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.

These are just a few examples of the problem. There are many others. I provided an extensive list of modifications in the last 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.

This problem will slap you in the face 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. I would recommend reviewing again comments 3034, 3233, 3269, 3474 and 3480 in IEEE 802.16-05/019 as a starting guide.

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

Document under Review: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **4384R**

Comment submitted by: Jonathan

Labs

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	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). All these comments address the 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".

I feel this is a quick and not very careful attempt at solving a major problem with the amendment. Here is just one example where this solution does not solve the problem: Look at page 52, line 19, section 6.3.2.3.23 which is titled in 802.16-2004 "SS Basic Capability Request (SBC-REQ) message", but is now titled in 16e/D7 as "MS basic capability request (SBC-REQ) message". To me this is telling me that with the changes from the amendment, SBC-REQ are now only defined for MS and not fixed SS.

I think it gets worse 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.

These are just a few examples of the problem. There are many others. I provided an extensive list of modifications in the last 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.

This problem will slap you in the face when this amendment 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. I would recommend reviewing again comments 3034, 3233, 3269, 3474 and 3480 in IEEE 802.16-05/019 as a starting guide.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

See 4353

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Extensive MS/SS repairs were adopted during the ballot resolution meeting and for D10.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001037**

Comment Date

Comment # **4379**

Comment submitted by: Brian

Kiernan

Member

2005/04/28

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	573	Starting Line #	1	Fig/Table#	Section	12
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	---	------------	---------	----

I object to the resolution of comments #3520 and #3521, both of which dealt with system profiles.

Without adoption of definitive system profiles 802.16e cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called a standard. It can't even be called a "cookbook". In reality it is more like a shopping list from which anybody can pick any combination of non-interoperable ingredients.

Definitive system profiles are absolutely required. Despite the shortcomings identified as the reason for their rejection, the system profiles proposed during the last recirc were at least a starting point in defining an interoperable set of parameters.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution C80216e-05_60r2 or any subsequent updates or revisions to it.

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

See comment 4353.

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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **4379R**

Comment submitted by: Brian

Kiernan

2005-04-28

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	573	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	12
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	---------	----

I object to the resolution of comments #3520 and #3521, both of which dealt with system profiles. Without adoption of definitive system profiles 802.16e cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called a standard. It can't even be called a "cookbook". In reality it is more like a shopping list from which anybody can pick any combination of non-interoperable ingredients. Definitive system profiles are absolutely required. Despite the shortcomings identified as the reason for their rejection, the system profiles proposed during the last recirc were at least a starting point in defining an interoperable set of parameters.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution C80216e-05_60r2 or any subsequent updates or revisions to it.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Superseded
---------------------	--------------------------------------

[See comment 4353](#)

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: **0001037**

Comment Date

Comment # **4387**Comment submitted by: **Remi****Chayer**

Member

2005/04/28

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	---------

I object to the resolution of Comment 3250 in 80216-05_12r3 (which was related to comments #1850, #1859, #1861 and #1864 in 80216-05_010). It is important to include complete profiles in the document. Contribution C80216e-05_60r2 was a start.

Suggested Remedy

The working group should start developing complete profiles based on the input from the participants.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected-Duplicate****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See 4353](#)**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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **4387R**Comment submitted by: **Remi****Chayer**

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

I object to the resolution of Comment 3250 in 80216-05_12r3 (which was related to comments #1850, #1859, #1861 and #1864 in 80216-05_010). It is important to include complete profiles in the document. Contribution C80216e-05_60r2 was a start.

Suggested Remedy

The working group should start developing complete profiles based on the input from the participants.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected-Duplicate**[See comment 4353](#)**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 # **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

Document under Review: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5700R**Comment submitted by: **Greg****Phillips**

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	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:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

no text proposed, see comments No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

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 # **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: Superceded
---------------------	--------------------------------------

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

Document under Review: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5733R**

Comment submitted by: Jonathan

Labs

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	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 amendment 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 amendment 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:****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

MS/SS use was extensively cleaned up for D10.

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 # **5689**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
The command HO-IND appears in the figure but not in the draft. Is this supposed to be MOB-HO-IND?	Technical, Binding	577	23		C.1.1

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: **802.16e/D9**

Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5689R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **577**

Starting Line #

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 occurances 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:

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

This was addressed by a global clean-up of MOB_HO-IND.

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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5269R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Binding	181			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:	Recommendation by
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group:
---------------------	--------------------

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Notes: 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 # **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: **802.16e/D9**

Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5695R**

Comment submitted by: [James](#)

[Gilb](#)

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
I am continuing to find commands in MSCs that don't exist elsewhere.	Technical, Binding				

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:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

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

[Informative Annexes C and D](#) were updated for consistency with normative text.

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: **802.16e/D9**

Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5606R**

Comment submitted by: [James](#)

[Gilb](#)

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **475**

Starting Line #

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 "LDPC Direct Encoding"](#).

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of 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 # **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.

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

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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5004R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	9	Starting Line #	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

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)' 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 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 Oorderly 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.'

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of 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 # **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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5344R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Comment	Type Technical, Binding	Starting Page # 216	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section 7.2.2.4.1
---------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	------------	--------------------------

Table 133 is missing the headers from the part that continues onto the next page.

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.

Suggested Remedy

Format Table 133 appropriately

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group:****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** i) to do

This comment addresses "continued" on tables. I've tried to correct as many as I can during the editorial process, but some of the existing tables may still lack proper continuation flags. The difficult part about this is that a given table may not cross a page boundary when it is examined, so it looks okay until text that precedes the table is added, causing a split between pages. We expect that, as part of the IEEE editorial clean-up process, any remaining tables will be corrected.

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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5480R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Binding	327			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:****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** i) to do

This comment addresses "continued" on tables. I've tried to correct as many as I can during the editorial process, but some of the existing tables may still lack proper continuation flags. The difficult part about this is that a given table may not cross a page boundary when it is examined, so it looks okay until text that precedes the table is added, causing a split between pages. We expect that, as part of the IEEE editorial clean-up process, any remaining tables will be corrected.

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	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Binding	vario	vario		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: **802.16e/D9**Ballot Number: **0001056**

Comment Date

Comment # **5696R**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

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

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:****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** i) to do

This comment addresses "continued" on tables. I've tried to correct as many as I can during the editorial process, but some of the existing tables may still lack proper continuation flags. The difficult part about this is that a given table may not cross a page boundary when it is examined, so it looks okay until text that precedes the table is added, causing a split between pages. We expect that, as part of the IEEE editorial clean-up process, any remaining tables will be corrected.

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

2005/08/05

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