2005/09/13 IEEE 802.16-05/069

Document under Review: P802.16-2004/Cor1/D4 Ballot Number: 0001073 Comme

Comment # 051 Comment submitted by: David James Member 2005-08

Comment Type Technical, Binding Starting Page # 999 Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section

Changes such as needed to reduce the lengths of figures and tables cannot be safely deferred to the editors, as was proposed in the resolutions. My vote therefore is Disapprove.

Suggested Remedy

Incorporate all changes, pass none to the editors.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Rejected Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

There is no specific indication of required changes to do. Taking an educated guess that he commenter refers to his proposed changes in previous circulation that were rejected, then please note coordination comment #556 in 80216-05_042r from Michelle Turner, the IEEE stateditor:

"Please note, upon approval of the last balloted draft the document, the following will take place: The approved draft will be copyedited for grammar, punctuation, syntax, English usage, and style according to the IEEE Standards Style Manual." Therefore, the group believes that IEEE style problems will be handled in this process. In addition, the group believes that doing modifications to tables in a non compatible v to the baseline document in an amendment project will reduce the readability of the standard as a whole.

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

There is no specific indication of required changes to do. Taking an educated guess that he commenter refers to his proposed changes in previous circulation that were rejected, then please note coordination comment #556 in 80216-05_042r from Michelle Turner, the IEEE stated editor:

"Please note, upon approval of the last balloted draft the document, the following will take place: The approved draft will be copyedited for grammar, punctuation, syntax, English usage, and style according to the IEEE Standards Style Manual." Therefore, the group believes the IEEE style problems will be handled in this process. In addition, the group believes that doing modifications to tables in a non compatible v to the baseline document in an amendment project will reduce the readability of the standard as a whole.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16-2004/Cor1/D3 Ballot Number: 0001008 Comment Date

Comment # 257 Comment submitted by: Lalit Kotecha Member 7/10/2005

Comment Type Technical, Binding Starting Page # 103 Starting Line # 40 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.4.7

Deletion of sec 8.4.4.7 violates PAR.

Sec 8.4.4.7 was introduced to enrich 802.16 standards for using beam-forming technologies. This section has gone through numerous informal and formal discussion before adopted by working group as a part of the standard

Suggested Remedy

Revert deletion of sec 8.4.4.7 - bring back this section into standards

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The section was deleted since members idenified a number of operational problems in the direct beam forming mode and unless the problems are fixed the section should be deleted.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16-2004/Cor1/D4 Ballot Number: 0001073 Comme

Comment # 017 Comment submitted by: Lalit Kotecha Member 2005-08

Comment Type Technical, Binding Starting Page # 118 Starting Line # 43 Fig/Table# Section 8.4.4.7

My original comment did not get resolved satisfactory in the last 802.16 meeting.

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Rejected Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The original comment referenced is Comment 247 in IEEE 802.16-05/042r5 (see IEEE 802.16-05/060r1). That comment regarded deletion Subclause 8.4.4.7, which was one of the optional AAS methods.

The resolution of Comment 247 was to reject it for the following reason: "The section was deleted since members identified a number of operational problems in the direct beam forming mode and unless the problems are fixed the section should be deleted." This response he been recirculated multiple times.

To expand on this point, the mode presented in Subclause 8.4.4.7 was inconsistent with the mandatory OFDMA mode, presenting new fra structure and new training sequences (FLI FLT) but with only a vague description of how actually build them.

Deleting the section does not prevent the ability of implementing AAS, since a well defined method still exists in the standard.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16-2004/Cor1/D5 Ballot Number: 0001080 Comment Date

Comment # Comment submitted by: Lalit Kotecha Member 2005-09-21

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

Not satisfied with resolution of comment. Continue my Disapprove vote with same comment

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Repeat of Comment

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Please see the response to Comment 017 in IEEE 802.16-05/065r5 (P802.16-2004/Cor1/D4 Sponsor Ballot Recirculation Comments).

No action need be taken, as the comment has already been recirculated.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items