



Project	<b>IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group</b> < <a href="http://ieee802.org/16">http://ieee802.org/16</a> >	
Title	<b>P802.16f/D6 Sponsor Ballot Recirculation: Ballot Results and Response to Comment Received</b>	
Date Submitted	<b>2005-08-27</b>	
Source(s)	Roger Marks NIST 325 Broadway Boulder, CO 80305	Voice: +1-303-497-7837  <a href="mailto:r.b.marks@ieee.org">mailto:r.b.marks@ieee.org</a>
Re:	P802.16f/D6 Sponsor Ballot: Third Recirculation	
Abstract	This document documents the results of the P802.16f/D6 Sponsor Ballot: Third Recirculation, and the response to the comment received.	
Purpose	To document the results of the P802.16f/D6 Sponsor Ballot Third Recirculation, for use by RevCom. It is also to be used for the IEEE 802 Executive Committee Conditional Approval procedure under Clause 21.	
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.16. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.	
Release	The contributor grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.16.	
Patent Policy and Procedures	The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy and Procedures < <a href="http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html">http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html</a> >, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder or applicant with respect to patents essential for compliance with both mandatory and optional portions of the standard." Early disclosure to the Working Group of patent information that might be relevant to the standard is essential to reduce the possibility for delays in the development process and increase the likelihood that the draft publication will be approved for publication. Please notify the Chair < <a href="mailto:chair@wirelessman.org">mailto:chair@wirelessman.org</a> > as early as possible, in written or electronic form, if patented technology (or technology under patent application) might be incorporated into a draft standard being developed within the IEEE 802.16 Working Group. The Chair will disclose this notification via the IEEE 802.16 web site < <a href="http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices">http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices</a> >.	

## P802.16f/D6 Sponsor Ballot Recirculation: Ballot Results and Response to Comment Received

### 1. Introduction

The P802.16f/D6 Third Recirculation ran from 11-26 August 2005.

### 2. Ballot Results

Following the Second Recirculation, the ballot results were.

77	Approve
6	Disapprove
5	Abstain

Following comment resolution, all six Disapprove voters indicated that they were satisfied with their comment resolutions and would change their vote to Approve.

During the recirculation, three of the six Disapprove voters changed their vote to Approve. No other changes of vote were received. Therefore, the final result was:

80	Approve
3	Disapprove
5	Abstain

### 3. Remaining Disapprove Voters

The three remaining Disapprove voters:

David Castelov
Joey Chou
Mike Geipel

did not cast a ballot or submit comments during the final recirculation and did not otherwise indicate their reasons for retaining their Disapprove vote. The Working Group is aware of no reasons why their previous indications of an intent to switch to Approve status were not completed.

The intent of these voters to convert to Approve is documented in the following three email transcripts:

**(1) David Castelow**

Subject: Vote change on .16f  
Date: Fri, 22 Jul 2005 18:28:17 +0100  
From: "David Castelow"  
To: "Roger B. Marks" <r.b.marks@ieee.org>  
Cc: "Phillip Barber"

Roger,

This is to inform you that as a result of the current draft document and the changes made to it this week I am changing my vote from Disapprove to Approve on 802.16f.

Do I need to formally do this through the SA also?

Regards

David

**(2) Joey Chou**

Subject: Vote for 802.16f sponsor ballot  
Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2005 16:16:54 -0700  
From: "Chou, Joey"  
To: "Roger B. Marks" <marks@boulder.nist.gov>  
Cc: "Phillip Barber"

Roger,

Please change my vote for 802.16f sponsor ballot from disapprove to approve.

Regards,

Joey Chou  
Broadband Wireless Division, Intel  
(480)554-6672

**(3) Mike Geipel**

From: "Mike Geipel"  
To: "Roger B. Marks" <r.b.marks@ieee.org>  
Cc: "Phillip Barber"  
Subject: RE: Geipel status  
Date: Thu, 28 Jul 2005 12:48:57 -0400

I'm baaaaack...

I am OK with disposition of the comments and willing to change my vote.

Actually, I hadn't intended to submit another comment (2035L). I had sent email to amend the "accept-modify" text I had suggested in a reply comment I had previously made (to 2002). (This was primarily to delete a copy-paste error from the draft.)

This was a result of a dozen or more messages that Krzysztof and I had exchanged during the Plenary session about our reply comments. (We may have been the only two to submit replies, but neither of us could be there in person at this time.) I believe that Phillip was CCed on most of these messages.

(This email effort was fruitful; we did reach some consensus...) I really appreciated Phillip's willingness to keep us "in the loop".

If it helps, I am willing to withdraw 2035L, as long as that does not affect the resolution of comment 2002.

--

Mike Geipel  
Axxcelera Broadband Wireless

#### 4. Comment Received

During the Recirculation, one comment, a Coordination Comment from James R. Frysinger, was received:

```
# Ballot/Comment Data for 0001072 (P802.16f/D6 3rd Recirculation)
# Submitted Fri Aug 26 18:29:54 EDT 2005
# Type: comment
# Record Number: 00001002
```

```
ballot_code = 0001072
form_type = comment
ieee_number = 00001002
name = James R. Frysinger
email =
phone = 843.953.7644
fax = 843.953.4824
org = College of Charleston/Dept. of Physics and Astronomy
page = general
line =
subclause =
comment_type = Coordination
comment = I see that one of my two comments on D5 had an effect on this document and I am satisfied with the resolution of that one comment. However, I see no effect that the other comment had. There seems to be no spreadsheet of comment resolutions in this package and I cannot find any record of any personal correspondence sent to me by the WG. Thus, my other comment remains unresolved.
suggested_remedy = Resolve my remaining comment from the D5 recirculation.
```

#### 5. Comment Response

On behalf of the IEEE 802.16 Working Group, the Working Group Chair has prepared the following response:

The Working Group received and responded to two Coordination Comments from Mr. Frysinger. Responses were prepared to both comments. The ballot recirculation cover letter included the sentence: "For a complete set of comments and resolutions from the latest recirculation, please see

the hyperlinked document [IEEE 802.16-05/044r4](#)." On the cover letter, the document number [IEEE 802.16-05/044r4](#) was hyperlinked to the URL [http://ieee802.org/16/docs/05/80216-05\\_044r4.pdf](http://ieee802.org/16/docs/05/80216-05_044r4.pdf). Clicking that link would normally lead to download of the comment resolution file [IEEE 802.16-05/044r4](#). That file includes Mr. Frysinger's comments as Comments 2009 and 2010.

To the best of our understanding, Mr. Frysinger is satisfied with the resolution of his Comments 2010. However, he indicates that he is not satisfied with the resolution of his Comment 2009, and we understand that he has not seen the Working Group's response. We believe that the response was complete and responsive. For convenience, we repeat below Comment 2009 and the Working Group's response.

**Comment # 2009**                      **Comment submitted by:** James R. Frysinger      **Comment Type:** Coordination

Throughout the document, the unit symbol dBm is found. This is not defined in IEEE/ASTM SI 10 nor in IEEE Std 260.1; these define instead the unit decibel (dB). In fact, IEEE/ASTM SI 10 states in clause 3.5.5, "Attachments of letters to a unit symbol as a means of giving information about the nature of the quantity is incorrect." IEEE Std 260.1 states that reference levels are to be indicated in the text or as part of the quantity symbol, not as part of the unit symbol. The proper emendment would be to either provide annotated quantity symbols or to make a blanket statement that all levels are referenced to some particular value (perhaps 1 mV or perhaps 1 mW, but not both globally) and then to change all instances of dBm to dB.

It is recognized that other SDOs may recognize the unit with symbol dBm but support for its use here ought to be made readily available to the reader. If the WG considers it absolutely essential, for the sake of harmony with standards from other SDOs to use dBm, then this document needs to define that symbol up front and not leave it to the reader to find the correct answer. It would be circular logic to aver that those who already "know the meaning" do not need this support since they already know the meaning. Those who do not know the answer probably also do not know where to find it on their own and they would find no help on that in IEEE/ASTM SI 10 or IEEE Std 260.1.

**Suggested Remedy**

Emend to change all instances of dBm to dB (preferred) or provide a local definition at the front of the document for dBm (acceptable).

**Resolution of Group Decision of Group:** Rejected

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

The term "dBm" is used in IEEE Std 802.16-2004, the base standard. The P802.16f project MIB amendment is not the proper venue to address this issue. Modification/clarification of legacy language use of common technical terms in the base document is not within the scope of the P802.16f project authorization. The P802.16f project authorization limits the scope of the project to addressing only the addition of MIB related elements. Clearly, the legacy use of the common technical term 'dBm' in the base document is not a MIB specific element. However, the comment is squarely within the domain of the existing IEEE P802.16-2004/Cor 1 project, which is developing a Corrigendum to the same base standard. A relevant Coordination comment was submitted in the recent IEEE-SA Sponsor Ballot of this Corrigendum project:

SCC14 Coordination Comments on P802.16-2004/Cor 1: Corrigendum to IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 16: Air Interface for Fixed Broadband Wireless Access Systems

Very little in this long standard raises any concerns from SCC14. Here are a couple of picky points:

1) The decibel, dB, is of course a permitted unit (although, oddly, it is not SI). Likewise, the dBm is well-enough understood to be permitted also. But I'd like to see a definition (that is, the reference level) of dBm when it first appears (in subclause 8.3.10). The "m" and the "i" would be better as subscripts. 2) A little more care needs to be taken to ensure that all quantity symbols are set, as they should be, in italic. Note that k and K appear interchangeably in 8.4.4.5 2) (k is incorrect). The integer counting symbol n or N occasionally appears incorrectly as roman.

3) Note that the unit symbol for "second" is "s" and that for "millisecond" is "ms." In Table 342 I find the incorrect "msec," which is specifically not permitted.

For IEEE SCC14 John T. Scott 21 June 2005

The response to that comment will be:

1) In section 4, we have included the following abbreviations:

"dBm Decibels relative to one milliwatt dBi Decibels of gain relative to the zero dB gain of a free-space isotropic radiator"

[Note that dBm is taken from the IEEE Dictionary (IEEE Std 100-1996); dBi is taken from <<http://ntia.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1037/fs-1037c.htm>>]

Regarding subscripting the "m" or the "i", note that the IEEE Dictionary does not subscript the "m" in dBm. Nor does the baseline document IEEE Std 802.16-2004 subscript the "m" or the "i" in dBm or dBi, so I do not want the Corrigendum to be inconsistent with that document. Making such a change would be in the authority of the IEEE staff editor, however.

2) We have reviewed all quantity symbols through out the document (for example the symbol *k* in section 8.4.4.5.2), and edited them to be italic.

3) We have changed every instance of "msec" to "ms".

Since the P802.16f SCC14 Coordination comment is being fully addressed by the response to the Corrigendum Coordination comment, we believe it is most appropriate to make no corresponding change to the P802.16f draft.