To: RevCom  
Re: P802.16j Submittal

I have submitted an application for the approval of draft P802.16j/D9 under the P802.16j amendment PAR. The review is on the agenda for the RevCom meeting of 1 May 2009.

Draft P802.16j/D9 was reviewed in the fourth P802.16j ballot recirculation, from 20 March – 4 April. No new Disapprove votes were received. One comment was received: an Editorial Coordination comment as follows: “Meets all editorial requirements.” The final vote count, as reported by myBallot, was 161 Approve and 2 Disapprove.

I would also like to bring to your attention the matter of the relationship of this document to the P802.16Rev2/D9a draft, which is itself the basis of a submittal (under the P802.16 revision PAR) to the 1 May RevCom meeting. The P802.16j draft is being submitted as an amendment to the IEEE Std 802.16 as it will exist following the approval of P802.16Rev2/D9a. In conjunction with this issue, I would like to note the following points:

• P802.16Rev2/D9a, per the P802.16 revision PAR, is based on a consolidation of IEEE Std 802.16-2004 along with the amendments 802.16e, 802.16f, and 802.16g. Per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, Subclause 8.1.2, “Up to three amendments can be approved before the standard shall be revised, unless the base standard has been approved or reaffirmed within the past three years.” Consequently, P802.16j has been developed as an amendment to the new P802.16 revision.

• During each Sponsor Ballot recirculation, the voters have been notified of the situation and provided the most current P802.16Rev2 draft. For example, in the second recirculation, the cover letter stated the following: “As an additional reference, we are providing the draft P802.16Rev2/D8. This document, not an approved IEEE standard but currently in separate Sponsor Ballot, is intended as the baseline for 802.16j to amend.”

• During the last Sponsor Ballot recirculation, the voters were provided with P802.16Rev2/D9a (which has since been submitted to RevCom). The P802.16j Ballot Group was explicitly notified, both in the cover letter and in the ballot announcement, of the 802.16 Working Group’s expectation that P802.16Rev2/D9a would be the final draft of P802.16Rev2. In particular, the cover letter and the ballot announcement stated the following:

As noted during the previous recirculation, a revision of the base 802.16 standard is progressing in parallel with this amendment project. P802.16j/D9 is based on and will amend this new revision. In the current recirculation, the base document for the revision has been updated from P802.16Rev2/D9 to P802.16Rev2/D9a. This new draft D9a differs from the previous draft D9 only in subclause 1.2 (“Purpose”) on Page 1. The change was made as a result of RevCom decisions on 18 March 2009.
Other than subclause 1.2, P802.16Rev2/D9 and P802.16Rev2/D9a are identical. Although P802.16Rev2/D9a is not yet approved, it is currently in what the 802.16 Working Group expects will be its final Sponsor Ballot recirculation. Provided that the P802.16Rev2/D9a recirculation concludes successfully, we expect that P802.16Rev2/D9a will be considered for approval by RevCom and could be approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board as the latest revision of IEEE Std 802.16.

- We are aware that the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, Subclause 8.1.2, states that “Sponsor ballots of amendments and corrigenda shall also include access to the approved base standard and any approved amendments and corrigenda in order to provide sufficient information to the ballot group.” We are confident that we have met the spirit of this requirement. Furthermore, if our P802.16Rev2/D9a submittal application is approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board, then we will be able to state affirmatively (although retroactively) that the ballot group was afforded access to the approved base standard, so that we will have met the letter as well as the spirit of the rules.

We therefore request RevCom’s 1 May recommendation that P802.16j/D9 be approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board. Under the circumstances, it would be appropriate for P802.16j/D9 approval be specifically contingent on the approval of P802.16Rev2/D9a.

Sincerely,

Roger Marks
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access
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1. **PROJECT NUMBER:** P802.16j  
   **DATE:** 2009-02-06 (updt 2009-04-06)

3. **TITLE:** Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 16: Air Interface for Fixed and Mobile Broadband Wireless Access Systems - Amendment: Multihop Relay Specification

4. **SPONSOR** (Full name of society/committee): IEEE Computer Society/Local & Metropolitan Networks Committee +

5. **BALLOTING COMMITTEE:** C/LM/WG802.16 and MTT/SCC

6. **NAME OF WORKING GROUP:** IEEE 802.16 Working Group

7. **NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER**
   Roger B. Marks
   Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: r.b.marks@ieee.org

8. **DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT** (Check one from each column.)
   - ☑ New
   - ☐ Revision
   - ☐ Reaffirmation
   - ☐ Stabilization
   - ☐ Withdrawal

   ☐ Standard
   ☐ Recommended Practice
   ☐ Trial Use (2-year life cycle)

   ☑ Amendment/Corrigenda to an existing standard (Indicate number and year) P802.16

8A. **REAFFIRMATION ONLY:** The Sponsor confirms that the balloting group agrees that this standard continues to be useful in its current form and contains no significant obsolete or erroneous information.
   ☐ Yes ☐ No
9. BALLOT INFORMATION


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Gov’t/Military</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Producer/User</td>
<td>94/36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF ELIGIBLE BALLOTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INITIAL BALLOT</th>
<th></th>
<th>RECIRCULATION BALLOT (if applicable)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Number</td>
<td>Date Closed</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 6a</td>
<td>10 Sept. 2008</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Balloters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballots Returned</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives with Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives without Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstentions</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for abstentions:
- Lack of time = 8
- Lack of expertise = 3
- Conflict of Interest =
- Other = 1

10. RESOLUTION OF COMMENTS AND NEGATIVE VOTES

All balloting group members, observers, and coordinating groups have been advised of substantive changes made with respect to the balloted draft standard (in response to comments, in resolving negative votes, or for other reasons) and have received copies of all unresolved negative votes with reasons from the negative voter and the rebuttal, and have been advised that they have an opportunity to change their votes.

A. Have unresolved comments accompanying negative votes been circulated? Include unresolved negative comments and rebuttal.
- Yes ☑️
- No ☐
- No unresolved comments

B. Have substantive document changes been circulated?
- Yes ☑️
- No ☐
- No substantive changes

11. COORDINATION ACTIVITY (Not required for reaffirmation)

Using the abbreviations listed below, indicate the response received from each committee/organization required for coordination and include a copy of the response. Include documentation authorizing coordination by common membership, if applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Organization</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Committee/Organization</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC10 (IEEE Dictionary)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>SCC14 (Quantities, Units, &amp; Letter Symbols)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE Standards Editorial Staff</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IEEE Registration Authority Committee (RAC)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate below any unresolved problems from coordination activities.

(nothing)
12. PATENT/COPYRIGHT and REGISTRATION ISSUES
A. Any patent letters of assurance (LoAs) received by the Sponsor are to be forwarded to the PatCom Administrator [Fax: +1 732 875 0524].

B. Is there any copyrighted material in the proposed standard? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, include copyright release(s).

C. Is the registration of objects and/or numbers a provision of the proposed standard? □ Yes □ No □ Already approved by RAC
   If yes, include a proposal for review by the IEEE-SA Registration Authority Committee (RAC).

13. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ACTIVITIES (Not required for reaffirmation)
A. If any of the following statements apply, please check the box accordingly:

   □ It is intended to submit this document to ISO or ISO/IEC JTC1 via their Fast-Track method.
   □ It is intended to submit this document to IEC for adoption as an IEC/IEEE Dual Logo document.
   □ This document is a revision to a document previously adopted by either ISO, IEC or ISO/IEC JTC1.
   □ This document was jointly developed with another organization.
   □ This document will form the basis of, or be included in, another organization’s standard.

B. For the boxes checked above, please indicate the organization, technical committee name/number and contact information.

   Organization: □ ISO □ IEC □ ISO/IEC □ JTC1 □ ITU □ Other

   Name of the organization, if Other:

   Technical Committee/Subcommittee Number:

   Technical Committee/Subcommittee Name:

   Contact Information for the Person Responsible for Coordinating this Project:
   Name: José Costa
   Phone Number: 1-613-763-7574
   Email Address: costa@nortel.com

14. UNIT OF MEASUREMENT (check one)
   □ International System of Units (SI) - Metric
   □ Inch/Pound
   □ Both
   □ Not measurement sensitive
   □ Other

15. Source Materials Submitted to IEEE Standards Department
A. Have electronic versions of the source documents (text and figures) been provided? □ Yes □ No
   Format: FrameMaker

B. Will a diskette or other online material be required to accompany the published standard? □ Yes □ No

16. Submission checklist (X = included in submittal package N/A = Not applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Package Item</th>
<th>List URL if online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X This submittal form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Ballot summary form(s) (1 per ballot cycle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X PAR and PAR approval letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Coordination comments and responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X .pdf of final balloted draft #D9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Permissions &amp; copyright releases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This draft standard has been developed in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Sponsor and I am authorized by those policies and procedures to make this submittal.

Signature of Submitter

Title (role in Sponsor)
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