

From: M.Patterson@ieee.org
Subject: RevCom - Preliminary Comments - P802.16j (C/LM + MTT)
Date: 11 March 2009 1:42:13 PM PDT (CA)
To: "Roger B.Marks" <r.b.marks@ieee.org>

11 March 2009

Roger B. Marks
WiMAX Forum

cc: Paul Nikolich, C/LM Chair
Michael Janezic, MTT Liaison
Michael Kipness, Program Manager
Kim Breitfelder, Manager -- Standards Editing and Production

RE: NEW P802.16j (C/LM + MTT) Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 16: Air Interface for Fixed and Mobile Broadband Wireless Access Systems - Amendment: Multihop Relay Specification

Dear Roger,

I have circulated your submittal to the members of RevCom for review and determination of compliance with the procedures as stated in the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual.

Preliminary dispositions of the individual members of the Standards Review Committee received TO DATE are listed below, along with a committee roster so you can directly contact any member whose comment requires a reply. Please contact RevCom members, CCing me, by 16 March 2009 to allow time to resolve issues prior to the 18 March 2009 RevCom meeting.

Please bear in mind that these comments are provided by individual members. The formal recommendation from the committee will occur at the 18 March 2009 RevCom meeting.

Additional comments received prior to the meeting that require your reply will be forwarded to you.

Sincerely,

Moira Patterson
Administrator, Governance; IEEE-SA
445 Hoes Lane
Piscataway, NJ 08854
Phone: (732) 562-3809
Fax: (732) 796-6966
Email: m.patterson@ieee.org

Phillip Barber Recuse; This Amendment is dependent upon acceptance of the P802.16REV2/D9 revision draft.

John Barr

Victor Berman

Ted Burse APPROVE

Clint Chaplin -

Wael Diab

Andy Drozd

Alex Gelman -

John Kulick I assume that in his cover letter to RevCom, Roger Marks meant to say that they had received 160 APPROVE votes.

David Law [1] The IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual states in 1.2 that an amendment is 'Amendment: A document that contains new material to an existing IEEE standard and may contain technical corrections to that standard.'. This amendment however is not to an existing IEEE standard but instead to a revision which is also on the agenda, IEEE P802.16/D9. At a minimum this amendment should have been marked as contingent upon this revision but on review of the IEEE 802.16j PAR I don't see this either, nor is the IEEE 802.16 PAR marked as having IEEE P802.16j contingent on it.

I note however that the cover letter accompanying this submittal does make this situation clear and that the cover letters that accompanied the 3rd recirculation addresses the situation. We therefore at a minimum need to ensure the correct sequencing - if the revision is approved after the amendment the amendment would be withdrawn since it isn't in the revision. In addition the sequencing of the RevCom agenda isn't sufficient since we only make recommendations to the SASB and it is possible that these items will be on the consent agenda making the sequencing unclear.

I therefore believe that, at a minimum, this submittal has to be conditional approved based on the approval of the IEEE 802.16 revision to ensure the correct sequencing. This mirrors the approach that has been used in the past for submittals that have been marked contingent.

Glenn Parsons -

Jon Rosdahl

Sam Sciacca -

Howard Wolfman

Editorial (Perry) Meets all editorial requirements.