#### IEEE 802.16-05/010r4

Document	under Revie	w: P802.16e/D5		Ballot Nu	nber: 0000754			Comment Date
Comment #	1902	Comment submitted by:	James	Gil	o	Member		2004-11-04
Comment	туре <mark>Тес</mark>	hnical, Binding	Starting	Page # 339	Starting Line # 14	Fig/Table#	Section E	
This annex h	as empty su	ubclauses, 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

Document under Review:802.16e/D9Comment #1902RComment submitted by:CommentType Technical, BindingThis annex has empty subclauses, e.g. E.1.1	Ballot Number: 0001056 James Gilb Starting Page # 339 Starting Line # 14	Fig/Table# Section E	Comment Date 2004-11-04
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 Grou	ib:		
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			

## IEEE 802.16-05/010r4

Document	under R	eview: P802.16e/D5		E	Ballo	ot Nur	nber: 0000754				Comment Date
Comment #	1874	Comment submitted by:	James			Gilb	D		Member		2004-11-04
Comment	Туре	Technical, Binding	Starting	Page	#	332	Starting Line # Vario	C	Fig/Table#	Section (	
The MSC ref 802.16-2004		2 commands, I-am-host-of and	MSS-inf	o-req,	, tha	ıt do r	not appear in this docu	ume	nt or in 802.16-200	)1, are they	defined in

#### 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 Recommendati	on	
Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Rejected	
Reason for Group's Decis	sion/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 I) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns** 

Document under Review:	802.16e/D9	Ballot	Number: 0001056		Comment Date
Comment # 1874R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb		2004-11-04
Comment Type Techn The MSC references 2 con 802.16-2004?	ical, Binding nmands, I-am-host-of and		32 Starting Line # do not appear in this docu	Fig/Table# ment or in 802.16-200	Section C 01, are they defined in
Suggested Remedy If they are not defined in 802.16	-2004, these need to be replac	ced with the actual cor	nmand name that is passed ove	er the air.	
Proposed Resolution R	ecommendation:		Recommendation by		
Reason for Recommendatior Resolution of Group	n Decision of Grou	nb:			
Reason for Group's Decisio	n/Resolution				
Group's Notes Group's Action Items					
Editor's Notes A re-work of Annex C removed Editor's Questions and Con Editor's Action Items					

#### IEEE 802.16-05/010r4

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D5	Ballot Nu	mber: 0000754			Comment Date
Comment #	1867	Comment submitted by:	James Gill	b	Member		2004-11-04
Comment	туре Techn	ical, Binding	Starting Page # 319	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section C	
[Page 319-33		es]	o document: HO notifier	ation * 40 pro * Aroth	hav defined in 802.1	6 20042	

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 Recommendat	ion	
Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Rejected	
Reason for Group's Deci	sion/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 I) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns** 

Document under Review	v: 802.16e/D9	Ballot N	lumber: 0001056			Comment Date
Comment # 1867R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb			2004-11-04
[Page 319-332; various li	nnical, Binding nes] are in the figure, but not in t	Starting Page # 319		Fig/Table# Are they defined in 80.	Section C 2.16-2004?	
Suggested Remedy If they are not defined in 802.	16-2004, these need to be repla	ced with the actual comm	nand name that is passed o	over the air.		
Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Re	commendation by			
Reason for Recommendati Resolution of Group Reason for Group's Decis	Decision of Gro	up:				
Group's Notes						
Group's Action Items						
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions k) done	1				
A re-work of Annex C remove	ed the commands in question.					
Editor's Questions and Co	oncerns					
Editor's Action Items						

## IEEE 802.16-05/010r4

Document under Review	w: P802.16e/D5	В	allot Nu	umber: 0000	0754			Comment Date
Comment # <b>1010</b>	Comment submitted by:	James	G	ilb		Memb	ber	2004-11-04
	hnical, Binding e 7.x.x.x) are missing the sul	Starting Page bclause numbe		Starting L	.ine # 25	Fig/Table#	Section	7.8.1.2.2
Suggested Remedy Provide the correct subcla	ause numbers here and thro	ughout the draft	t, e.g., s	search for x.	х.			
Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:		Rec	commendatio	n by			
Reason for Recommendat								
Resolution of Group	Decision of Gro	up: Accepted						
Provide the correct subcla	ause numbers here and thro	ughout the draft	t, e.g., s	search for x.	х.			
Reason for Group's Decis	sion/Resolution							
Group's Notes Group's Action Items								
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions c) instru	uctions unclear						
Editor's Questions and C What are the correct sub	oncerns clauses that are supposed to	o go in here?						
Editor's Action Items								

Document under Review	802.16e/D9	Ballot Nu	umber: 0001056		Comr	nent Date
Comment # 1010R	Comment submitted by:	James G	ilb		2004	4-11-04
	nical, Binding		Starting Line # 25	Fig/Table#	Section 7.8.1.2.2	2
The cross references (See	e 7.x.x.x) are missing in the	subclause numbers.				
Suggested Remedy						
	numbers here and throughout	the draft, e.g. search for x	<b>X</b> .			
	0					
Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Rec	commendation by			
Reason for Recommendation	on					
Resolution of Group	Decision of Gro	up:				
Reason for Group's Decisi	ion/Resolution					
Group's Notes						
Group's Action Items						
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions k) done					
Editor's Questions and Co						
Editor's Action Items						

## IEEE 802.16-05/010r4

Document under	Review: P802.16e/D5	Ballot Number: 0000754		Comment Date		
Comment # 1945			Member	2004-11-04		
Comment Type	Technical, Binding	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 55Action 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	e definition of Action Code 0x00 is	s being redefined in 16e, which I think brea	aks backward compatibility.)			
Suggested Remedy Throughout the doc mobile SS's.	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					
Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by				
Reason for Recomm	endation					
Resolution of Group	Decision of Gro	oup: Superceded				
This comment has	been superseded by comment #	ŧ71.				
Reason for Group's This comment has		71 which changes the usage of MSS and	ISS.			
Group's Notes Group's Action Item	s					
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions I) none	needed				
Editor's Questions a	nd Concerns					
Editor's Action Item	S					

2003/00/12							
Document under Review:			<sub>nber:</sub> 0001056		Comment Date		
Comment # 1945R	Comment submitted by:	Jonathan La	DS		2004-11-04		
Comment Type Tech	nical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page # 865	Starting Line # 65	Fig/Table#	Section		
	odes and Actions in the P802.1 S' acronym in the description of I or mobile.	16-REVd/D5 (p. 78, line 42) f the Actions. Such a chang	with Table 55a in P802.16 e tells me that those Action	e/D5 (p. 29, line 20), o Codes now only app	one can see that the 'SS' acronym ly to mobile SS's and not SS's in		
Suggested Remedy							
Throughout the document, use mobile SS's.	'SS' when the function can ap	pply to both fixed and mobil	e SS's and use 'MSS' whe	n the function only ap	plies to		
Proposed Resolution R	ecommendation:	Reco	mmendation by				
Reason for Recommendatio	n						
Resolution of Group	Decision of Gro	oup:					
Reason for Group's Decisi	on/Resolution						
Group's Notes							
Group's Action Items							
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions k) done	e					
Editor's Questions and Cor	ncerns						
Editor's Action Items							

#### IEEE 802.16-05/012r7

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D6	Ballot Number: 0001010						Comment Date
Comment #	3384	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb	)		Member		2005/03/09
Comment	туре Techn	ical, Satisfied (was	Starting	Page # 319	Starting Line # V	vario	Fig/Table#	Section C	
{pages 319- "The followin	g commands a	are in the figure, but not the	e docume	ent: HO-notificat	ion-*, HO-pre-*.	It is inco	orrect to justify it by	claiming a fo	rward

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-ModifiedRecommendation byRemove 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** 

#### IEEE 802.16-045r4

Document under Review: 802.16e/D9			E	Ballot Nu		Comment Date		
Comment #	3384R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gil	lb			2005-03-09
Comment	туре Теср	nical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page	# 319	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section C	
{pages 319-33 "The following (		n the figure, but not the docume	ent: HO-notificatio	on-*, HO-r	ore-*. It is incorrect to ju	stify it by claiming a forw	vard	

"The following commands are in the figure, but not the document: HO-notification-\*, HO-pre-\*. It is incorrect to justify it by claiming a forware 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 Recommendat	Reason for Recommendation										
Resolution of Group	Decision of	Group:									
Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution											
	sion/Resolution										
Group's Notes											
Group's Action Items											
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions k) o	lone									
Editor's Questions and C	oncerns										
Editor's Action Items											

#### IEEE 802.16-05/023r8

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8		Ballot Nur	nber: 0001037			Comment Date
Comment #	4384	Comment submitted by:	Jonathan	Lat	)S	Membe	r	2005/04/28
Comment	туре Techn	ical, Binding	Starting P	age # 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
Decision of Group: Rejected
Image: Commendation of Group: Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Lack of specific text.
Image: Commendation of Group's Action Items
Image: Commendation of Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes
Editor's Actions I) none needed
Image: Commendation of Group of Group's Items
Image: Commendation of Group of

Document under Ro	eview: 802.16e/D9	Ballot N	umber: 0001056			Comment Date			
Comment # 4384R	Comment submitted by:	Jonathan L	abs						
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 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 6.3.2.3.23 eVRC eregister command (DREG-CMD) message, specifically at Table 55Action 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. 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.									
	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.								
	Recommendation:		commendation by						
Reason for Recommen	ndation								
Resolution of Group	Decision of G	roup: Superceded							
See 4353									
Reason for Group's [	Decision/Resolution								
Group's Notes Group's Action Items									
Editor's Notes Extensive MS/SS repairs Editor's Questions and	Editor's Actions k) dor s were adopted during the ballot res d Concerns		0.						
Editor's Action Items									

## IEEE 802.16-05/023r8

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Document under Review	: P802.16e/D8	Ballot N	umber: 0001037		Comment Date				
Comment # <b>4379</b>	Comment submitted by:	Brian K	iernan	Member	2005/04/28				
, ,	nical, Binding f comments #3520 and #3	Starting Page # 573 521, both of which dea	•	Fig/Table#	Section 12				
	tive system profiles 802.16 more like a shopping list fro								
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:	Red	commendation by						
Reason for Recommendation	on								
Resolution of Group	Decision of Gro	oup: Superceded							
Reason for Group's Decis See comment 4353.	ion/Resolution								
Group's Notes Group's Action Items									
Editor's Notes Editor's Questions and Co	Editor's Actions I) none	needed							
Editor's Action Items									

Document	under Review:	802.16e/D9	Ballot	Ballot Number: 0001056				Comment Date
Comment #	4379R	Comment submitted by:	Brian	Kiernan				2005-04-28
Comment	туре Techn	ical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page # 5	573 Star	ting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	12
Without adoption "cookbook". In Definitive system	resolution of com on of definitive sy reality it is more em profiles are al	iments #3520 and #3521, both vstem profiles 802.16e cannot, like a shopping list from which psolutely required. Despite the were at least a starting point in	by any stretch of the i an anybody can pick an e shortcomings identif	imagination y combinati fied as the i	, be called a standa on of non-interoper reason for their reje	able ingredients.		
Suggested Re Adopt contribu	-	5_60r2 or any subsequent upd	dates or revisions to it					
Proposed Res	solution R	ecommendation:		Recomme	ndation by			
Reason for R	Recommendatior	1						
Resolution of	Group	Decision of Grou	up: Superceded					
See comme	nt 4353							
Reason for G	Group's Decisio	on/Resolution						
Group's Note	S							
Group's Actic	on Items							
Editor's Note	S	Editor's Actions I) none r	needed					
Editor's Ques	tions and Con	cerns						
Editor's Actio	on Items							

## IEEE 802.16-05/023r8

Document under Review	v: P802.16e/D8	Ballot Number: 0001037		Comment Date				
Comment # <b>4387</b>	Comment submitted by:	Remi Chayer	Member	2005/04/28				
I object to the resolution	nnical, Binding of Comment 3250 in 80216 ortant to include complete p	Starting Page # 999 Starting Line # 6-05_12r3 (which was related to comments a profiles in the document. Contribution C802	Fig/Table# Section #1850, #1859, #1861 and #1864 in 16e-05_60r2 was a start.					
Suggested Remedy The working group shoul	d start developing complete	profiles based on the input from the particip	ants.					
Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by						
Reason for Recommendation   Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Rejected-Duplicate								
Reason for Group's Decis See 4353	sion/Resolution							
Group's Notes Group's Action Items								
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions I) none	needed						
Editor's Questions and Co	oncerns							
Editor's Action Items								

Document under Review: 802.16e/D9 Ballot Number: 0001056 C								
Comment # 4387R	Comment submitted by:	Remi C	hayer					
I object to the resolution of	echnical, Satisfied (was of Comment 3250 in 80216-05_12r ortant to include complete profiles in				Section			
Suggested Remedy The working group should	l start developing complete profiles	based on the input from th	ne participants.					
Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Rec	ommendation by					
Reason for Recommend	dation							
Resolution of Group See comment 4353	Decision of Gro	oup: Rejected-Duplicate						
Reason for Group's Do	ecision/Resolution							
Group's Notes Group's Action Items								
Editor's Notes Editor's Questions and	,	needed						
Editor's Action Items								

#### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8		Ballot Nu	<sub>mber:</sub> 0001045			Comment Date		
Comment #	5700	Comment submitted by:	Greg	Ph	illips	Membe	r	2005/06/08		
Comment	туре Techn	ical, Binding	Starting Page	# Gen	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section			
In light of the	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 sufficent detail for us not to ignore.

#### Suggested Remedy

Due to the late nature of this report sufficent 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 I) none needed

No action required for this comment.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Document	under Review	<sub>w:</sub> 802.16e/D9	Ballot I	Number: 0001056			Comment Date
Comment #	5700R	Comment submitted by:	Greg	Phillips			
Comment	Туре Тес	hnical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	
If we knowingly compromised w One section of "Overall, signifi EAP Key Mana that if they are Their are many I strongly make	/ allow the ado we can expect the specific te icant issues we agement Frame not repaired, I / other items p e note that the	IETF on the security review of II option of this standard after a rep significant resistance from the ext from the report that highlight ere found in the usage of EAP I ework as well as AAA Key Man EEE 802.16e will provide little in resented in addition to those re work undertaken in this review e have highly qualified team des	port showing that the secu market in adopting this ter is these concerns is: by 802.16e. Issues were f agement Requirements. So in the way of guaranteed s lating to interoperability of process should not be igr	rity of data transferred unde chnology. ound with IEEE 802.16e co Several of the issues discov ecurity." AAA servers and failings o nored. These are very seriou	mpatibility with RFC 37 ered are considered "cr f the current document.	748, the itical" in	
outlined in the	nature of this report.	report sufficent time to draft a to p://www.drizzle.com/~aboba/EA	·	e. I suggest that the remedy	process be undertaker	n as	
Proposed Re	solution	Recommendation:	R	ecommendation by			
Reason for R	Recommendat	ion					
Resolution of	Group	Decision of Gr	oup: Superceded				
no text propos	ed, see comm	ents No text proposed. See c	omments 5129, 5135, 53	20, 5321, 5329, 5341, 561	4, 5669.		
Reason for G	Group's Decis	sion/Resolution					
Group's Note							
Group's Actic	on Items						
Editor's Note	S	Editor's Actions I) none	e needed				
Editor's Ques	tions and C	oncerns					
Editor's Actio	on Items						

#### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: P802.16e/D8		Ballot Number: 0001045				Comment Date	
Comment #	5733	Comment submitted by:	Jonathan L	abs	Member		2005/06/08
Comment	Туре Тес	hnical, 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 Recommendat	ion							
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 I) none needed							

**Editor's Questions and Concerns** 

Document	under Review:	802.16e/D9	Ballot Nu	ımber: 0001056			Comment Date
Comment #	5733R	Comment submitted by:	Jonathan La	abs			
comment 4384	esolutions of co in IEEE 802.16	nical, Satisfied (was mments 3034, 3233, 3269, 34 05/23r5. All these comments	address the improper usa	ge of SS versus MS versu	s FSS. The resolution of	of the	
definition of FS I feel this is a m the text change codes are now In my mind an S	" for the first set ajor problem wit is in 6.3.2.3.26 E defined for MSs SS can be either	MS in 802.16e draft for new te of comments from 05/12r3. F h the ammendment and it is no be/Re-register command (DRE , not SSs. This tells me that th a mobile SS or a fixed SS. MS podifications in a previous recir	for comment 4384, there we be being corrected by the g G-CMD) message, specific are are now no action code is only a mobile SS.	as not even a reason giver roup. Here is one example cally at Table 55Action co es for a fixed SS.	n for rejection! of the problem: if one lo odes and actions. All act	ooks at tion	
Sorrento to try t	to clean up the p	vill not provide "specific text" ag problem for the MAC section bu apparent when this ammendm	ut not part of it was accepted	ed.		meeting in	
Suggested Re	emedy						
Session 37 in S	Sorrento to fix the	SS, such that the text does no e problem in the MAC section again, as well as comments 3	(refer to comment 4001), I	out the entire contribution v	was rejected by the grou		
Proposed Res	solution R	ecommendation:	Rec	ommendation by			
Reason for R	ecommendatio	1					
Resolution of	Group	Decision of Gro	up:				
Reason for G	iroup's Decisio	on/Resolution					
Group's Notes Group's Actio							
Editor's Notes		Editor's Actions k) done	•				
	s extensively cle tions and Con	aned up for D10. <b>cerns</b>					
Editor's Actio	n Items						

#### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

**Editor's Action Items** 

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8	Ballot N	umber: 0001045		Comment Date
Comment #	5689	Comment submitted by:	James G	ilb	Member	2005/06/08
Comment	туре Techr	nical, Binding	Starting Page # 577	Starting Line # 23	Fig/Table#	Section C.1.1
The comma	nd HO-IND ap	pears in the figure but not	t in the draft. Is this su	pposed 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: 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 occurances 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

#### IEEE 802.16-045r4

Document	under Review	: 802.16e/D9		Ballot Nu	ımber: 0001056			Comment Date
Comment #	5689R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gi	ilb			
Comment	туре Tech	nical, Binding	Starting Page	e # 577	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section C.	1.1
The command	HO-IND appear	rs in the figure but not in the dra	ft. Is this suppo	sed to be N	10B-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 F	Recommendation:	Recommendation	by					
Reason for Recommendatio	Reason for Recommendation							
Resolution of Group	Decision of Group:							
Reason for Group's Decisi	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 globa	I clean-up of MOB_HO-IND.							
Editor's Questions and Concerns								
Editor's Action Items								

#### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8	Ballot Number: 0001045			Com		Comment Date
Comment #	5269	Comment submitted by:	James	Gil	b	Member		2005/06/08
Comment	туре Techn	ical, Binding	Starting Pa	age # 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 NotesEditor's Actions k) doneCould not find "MSS HO-RSP" in Figure 130e line 22; others are done.

**Editor's Questions and Concerns** 

### IEEE 802.16-045r4

Document under Review: 802.16e/D9		Ballot Number: 0001056			Comment Date		
Comment #	5269R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb			
Comment	Type Techni	cal, Binding	Starting Page # 18	S1 Starting Line #	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:		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 C	Editor's Questions and Concerns							
Editor's Action Items								

### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8	Ballot Number: 0001045					Comment Date
Comment #	5695	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb		Member		2005/06/08
Comment	т <sub>уре</sub> Techn	ical, Binding	Starting Page #	vario Starting	g 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 Recommendat	ion							
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	I) none needed						
Editor's Questions and C	oncerns							
Editor's Action Items								

### IEEE 802.16-045r4

Document under Review: 802.16e/D9		Ballot Number: 0001056				Comment Date	
Comment #	5695R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb			
Comment	туре Techni	cal, Binding	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	
Les services de la construction de la MOO de la color de la							

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:							
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 I	D were updated for consistency with normative text.							
Editor's Questions and Concerns								
Editor's Action Items								

### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8	Ballot	Number: 0001045			Comment Date
Comment #	5606	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb	Member		2005/06/08
Comment	туре Techn	ical, Binding	Starting Page # 4	5 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 ResolutionRecommendation: AcceptedRecommendation byMove 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** 

### IEEE 802.16-045r4

Document	under Review:	802.16e/D9	Ballot	Number: 0001056			Comment Date	
Comment #	5606R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb				
Comment	туре Technie	cal, Binding	Starting Page # 47	5 Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.9.2.5.2	
It is not proper	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 Recommendat	ion						
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 C	oncerns						
Editor's Action Items							

#### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8	Ballot	Number: 0001045		Comment Date
Comment #	5004	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb	Member	2005/06/08
Comment	туре Techni	cal, Binding	Starting Page # 9	Starting Line # Vario	Fig/Table# Sec	ction 3
Definitions ne	ed to stand or	their own, so acronyms r		out in each of the definitions.	In most cases it is bette	er 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 <u>base station (BS)</u> with which the <u>mobile station (MS)</u> has most recently completed registration at initial network-entry or during an <u>handover (HO)</u>.

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

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

3.75 fast BS switching (FBSS): <u>base station (BS)</u> switching that utilizes <u>a</u> fast switching mechanism to improve link quality. The <u>mobile station (MS)</u> 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 <u>base station (BS)</u> selection scheme.

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

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. <u>A mobile station (MS) is always a subsciber station (SS) unless specifically excepted otherwise in the standard.</u>

3.81 Optical 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) 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 <u>base station (BS)</u> with which the <u>mobile station (MS)</u> has most recently completed registration at initial network-entry or during an <u>handover (HO)</u>.

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

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

3.75 fast BS switching (FBSS): <u>base station (BS)</u> switching that utilizes <u>a</u> fast switching mechanism to improve link quality. The <u>mobile station (MS)</u> 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 <u>base station (BS)</u> selection scheme.

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

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 subsciber 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

#### 2

2005/08/12	2	IEEE 802.16-045r4								
Document u	under Review:	802.16e/D9		Ballot N	umber: 00	01056			Commen	t Date
Comment #	5004R	Comment submitted by:	James	Ģ	Silb					
Comment	туре Techr	nical, Binding	Starting Page	e # 9	Starting	Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	3	
		eir own, so acronyms need to l , BS, MSS and HO need to be		each of th	he definition	s. In most cas	es it is better to avoid u	using them		
Suggested Re	emedy									
Replace "hando In Clause 4, ren In Clause 4, ren [In 3. Definitions '3.5.1 neighbor I can be received 3.5.2 serving BS completed regis 3.5.3 target BS: 3.5.4 active BS: information. For '3.71 active set: managed by the '3.73 anchor BS mobile station (I (FBSS) support frame. 3.74 FA index: <i>J</i> specific configu 3.75 fast BS sw is only transmitt depending on th 3.76 frequency bandwidth prog 3.77 handover ( air-interface pro 3.78 group key or an ASA used	off" with "hando nove the definiti- nove the definiti- s, page 9, line 1 BS: For any mo l by the mobile s S: For any mobil stration at initial The base station An active BS is soft handover ( Active set is ap e mobile station S: For soft handover ( Active set is ap e mobile station S: For soft handover ( MS) is registere ing mobile station active I (FBSS): ing/receiving da he base station assignment (FA rammed to the B (HO): The proce ovided by anothe encryption key 0	e station (MS), the serving BS network-entry or during an har on (BS) that an mobile station ( 5 informed of the mobile station SHO), the mobile station (MS) plicable to SHO and FBSS. Th (MS) and base station (BS). Th over (SHO) or fast BS switching d, synchronized with, performs on (MS), this is the serving BS fic logical frequency assignment base station (BS) switching that ta to/from one of the active BS (BS) selection scheme. A): A frequency assignment (FA base station (BS). ss in which an mobile station ( er base station (BS). (GKEK): Encrypted by the KER GTEKs sent in multicast messa	ake" eak" as:] 3S is a base stati ndover (HO). (MS) intends to b n (MS)' capabilitie ) transmits/receiv ne active set cont he active set is a ig (FBSS) suppor s ranging with an that is designate ent (FA) index as fon (MS) in a met at utilizes a fast s S (anchor BS) at a G (MS) migrates from K that is derived ages by the BS to	ion (BS) w be register es, securit ves data to tains a list applicable rting mobil nd monitor ed to trans ssignment. thod outsi switching r any given gical assig om the air- from the A to MSs in t	rith which the red with at the y parameter o/from all act of active BS to soft hande le station (M rs the downli mit/receive of . FA index as de the scope mechanism to frame. The a nment of do -interface pro	e mobile statione end of a har is, service flow ive BSs in the So to the mobile over (SHO) an (S)s, this is a b inkDL for contri- data to/from the ssignment is u e of this stands to improve link anchor BS can wnlinkDL cent ovided by one EK is a randor ulticast group.'	n (MS) has most recent ndover (HO). s and full MAC context active set.' e station (MS). The acti d fast BS switching (FB ase station (BS) where ol information. For fast e mobile station (MS) a sed in combination wit ard. quality. The mobile stat change from frame to er frequency and chan base station (BS) to the n number generated by	tly ve set is SS)' the BS switching t a given h operator tion (MS) frame nel e t the BS		
		scriber station (SS) capable of ed otherwise in the standard.	communicating	while in m	otion. A mol	bile station (MS	ة) is always a subscibe	r station		
3.81 Oorderly p or prompted by	ower down proc a automatic pov	cedure: The procedure that the ver down mechanism).				, U				
3.82 scanning in (BS)s as targets		beriod intended for the mobile HO).	station (MS) to n	nonitor ne	eighbor BSs	to determine t	he suitability of the bas	e station		

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,

### IEEE 802.16-045r4

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 C	oncerns							
Editor's Action Items								

## IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8	Ballot M	lumber: 0001045		Comment Date	
Comment #	5344	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb	Member	2005/06/08	
Comment	туре Techn	ical, 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 Format Table 133 approp	Recommendation: Accepted priately	Recommendation by					
Reason for Recommendation	on						
Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Accepted						
Format Table 133 approp	priately						
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** 

IEEE 802.16-045r4

Document under Review	v: 802.16e/D9	Ballot	Number: 00010	56		Comment Date
Comment # 5344R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb			
Comment Type Tech	nnical, Binding	Starting Page # 21	6 Starting Lin	e# Fig	J/Table# S	Section 7.2.2.4.1
Make the headers appear on Framemaker for this.) Fix this	ders from the part that continues the second part of the table and here and all other locations in th he formatting is consistent throu	add "(continued)" to the draft. Almost all of the			0	k all of
Suggested Remedy						
Format Table 133 appropriate	ly					
Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	F	ecommendation	by		
Reason for Recommendati	on					
Resolution of Group	Decision of Gro	up:				
Reason for Group's Decis	ion/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** 

### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Re	view: P802.16e/D8	Ballot Number: 0001045					Comment Date
Comment # <b>5480</b>	Comment submitted by:	James	Gil	b	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	d the ta	able format (double-ruled	d lines) doesn't match	n the othe	r tables.
Suggested Remedy Add "(continued)" and	fix the table format.						
Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:		Reco	ommendation by			
Reason for Recommendation							
Resolution of Group	Decision of Gro	oup: 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** 

#### IEEE 802.16-045r4

Document	under Review	<sub>/:</sub> 802.16e/D9		Bal	lot Nui	mber: 0001056			Comment Date
Comment #	5480R	Comment submitted by:	James		Gil	b			
Comment	Type Tech	nnical, Binding	Starting F	Page #	327	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section	8.4.5.4.10.4
Table 298d is i	missing "(contir	nued)" in the title on the second	page and th	e 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 Recommendat	ion			
Resolution of Group	Decision	of Group:		
Reason for Group's Deci	sion/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** 

#### IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document	under Review:	P802.16e/D8		Bal	lot Nun	nber: 00	01045				Comment Date
Comment #	5696	Comment submitted by:	James		Gilb	D			Membe	r	2005/06/08
Comment	туре Techn	ical, Binding	Starting	g Page #	vario	Starting	Line #	vario	Fig/Table#	Section	various
The table hea "cont." or a s	ading needs to uitable notatio	repeat across pages at th n. Tables 298r and 298t ar	e top of e exam	each cor ples of th	ntinuatio is.	on of the	table a	and the ta	ble title should inc	lude one of	"continuation",
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** 

#### IEEE 802.16-045r4

Document	under Review	802.16e/D9	Ballot	Number: 0001056			Comment Dat	е
Comment #	5696R	Comment submitted by:	James	Gilb				
Comment	Type Tech	nical, Binding	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section		
		peat across pages at the top of Tables 298r and 298t are examp		e table and the table title sh	ould include one of "co	ontinuation",		
•	icated here and	throughout the draft. This is a rethat violate this requirement. The			<b>o</b>	tire draft as		
Proposed Res	solution	Recommendation:	R	ecommendation by				
Reason for R	Recommendatio	on						
Resolution of	Group	Decision of Gro	up:					
Reason for C	Group's Decis	ion/Resolution						
Group's Note	s							
Group's Actio	on Items							
Editor's Note	s	Editor's Actions i) to do						
continuation fla	ags. The difficul	tinued" on tables. I've tried to c t part about this is that a given t n pages. We expect that, as pa	able may not cross a pag	ge boundary when it is exam	ined, so it looks okay u	ntil text that prece		

Editor's Questions and Concerns

2005/08/05		IEEE 802.16-05/035r4			
Document under Review: F	P802.16e/D8	Ballot Nu	mber: 0001045		Comment Date
Comment # <b>5726</b>	Comment submitted by:	Dorothy Sta	anley	Member	2005/06/08
Comment Type Technica Errors in EAP usage identified		Starting Page # 999	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section 6.3
Suggested Remedy Address the issues identified	d in http://www.drizzle.co	m/~aboba/EAP/review	v.txt		
Proposed Resolution Rec	commendation: Supercede	ed Reco	ommendation by		
Reason for Recommendation No text proposed. See com Resolution of Group	nments 5129, 5135, 532 Decision of Grou		5614, 5669.		
Reason for Group's Decision/ No text proposed. See com Group's Notes Group's Action Items		20, 5321, 5329, 5341,	5614, 5669.		
	Editor's Actions I) none n	needed			
Editor's Questions and Conce Editor's Action Items	erns				