Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **001**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #**   **Starting Line #**   **Section** global

Make sure all Figs and Tables are referenced

Reason

This change was accepted in Comment 821 of Letter Ballot #3, but change was not implemented and comment was marked "defer to next round".

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **002**   **Comment submitted by:**   Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #**   **Starting Line #**   **Section** global

Make sure all tables have numbers and titles.

Reason

This change was accepted in Comment 821 of Letter Ballot #3, but change was not implemented and comment was marked "defer to next round".

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **003**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #**   **Starting Line #**   **Section**

{Note: the comment applies to D2. It is Subbu Ponnuswamy's Comment 1046 from LB#3 and was not previously considered.}

Change as per submission IEEE 802.16.1-01/25

Reason

1.   The number of bits is not consistent throughout the document: Figures 18 and 19 on page 20 and Table 1 on page 52, specify a 4-bit FSN. Figure 61 on page 104 indicate a 3-bit FSN field.
2.   3/4-bit FSN limits the maximum number of fragments (hence number of MPDUs) per-MSDU to 8/16. This may not be sufficient for some systems that may want to support smaller MPDUs.
3.   A per-packet FSN is not required for reassembly. Since two FC bits can unambiguously indicate the first and last fragments of an MSDU, a per-connection MPDU-Sequence number (MPDU-SN) works well for re-assembly.
4.   Per-packet FSN causes ambiguity in re-assembly. This is especially true if multiple MPDUs of the same connection are transmitted in the same frame. In general, the ambiguity exists if the last X consecutive fragments of packet (P) and the first (Total # fragments in P - X) consecutive fragments of packet (P + 1) of the same connection are lost.

It has been proposed by TG1 (in Session 12) to make the 3-bit FSN as a running count, as opposed to a per-packet FSN. This could still result in ambiguity, if eight consecutive MPDUs are lost. Though it may seem unlikely, this is still possible, e.g., all eight MPDUs are sent in the same frame during a fade.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Point #1 has been fixed previously
Point #2 : The number of fragments is not limited to 8.
Point #3&4 The fragmentation is per connection. Exactly 8 fragments has to be lost and it is wasteful to send multiple fragments of a packet in the same frame.

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **004**   **Comment submitted by:**   Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 7   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section**   ToC

Modify Table of Contents format to improve look when long section titles cause a line break.

See List of Figures and List of Tables for a better method.

Reason
The current method looks bad and is hard to read.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **005**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 17   **Starting Line #** 11   **Section** 1.4

{Note: the comment applies to D2. It is Scott Marin's Comment 1050 from LB#3 and was not previously considered.}

At a minimum, insert new sentence, "Figure 2 shows the 802.16 protocol layering."

Reason

Figure 2 is not introduced or explained. The explanation of Figure 2 is an excellent opportunity to introduced several acronyms noted in the figure.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

#7

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **006**   **Comment submitted by:**   Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 19   **Starting Line #** 57   **Section**   LoF

Delete initial spaces before titles of some figures and tables (e.g., Figure 41).

Reason

This causes the alignment to be off in the List of Figures and List of Tables

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 007   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 27   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 1

Revise Overview:

*Purpose should explain the unique role and application of this standard.
*IEEE 802 Architectural Conformance should explain the unique role of 802.16 in the 802 family and explain its differences from other 802 networks.
*Reference Model should be corrected to correctly show the scope of the standard. It should also be used to illustrate applications.

Reason
To make the standard more understandable.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items
Ken to provide suggestion

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **008**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 29   **Starting Line #** 61   **Section** 2

Review normative reference list for editorial corrections to harmonize the style with IEEE conventions.

Also, check for correct cross-references in text.

Reason

Editorial.

Cross-references were mentioned in Comment 367 of Letter Ballot #3; this comment was marked "defer to next round".

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 009   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 31   **Starting Line #** 31   **Section** 3

Add definitions:

frequency division duplex (FDD): A duplex scheme in which uplink and downlink transmissions use different frequencies but are typically simultaneous.

time-division duplex (TDD): A duplex scheme where uplink and downlink transmissions occur at different times but may share the same frequency.

Reason

These are important terms.
The definitions are those of 802.16.2/D3-2001.
Note that, according to these definitions, half-duplex FDD is both FDD and TDD. This is appropriate, since the separation is in both time and frequency.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

Definitions are ok.
The note on half-duplex is not correct

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **010**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 35   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section**

ARQ stands for "Automatic Repeat Request" instead of "Retransmit"

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace the list of acronyms with file "comment10.fm"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **011**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 35   **Starting Line #** 65   **Section** 4

Add the following acronym:

"ECB Electronic Code Book"

Reason
Used on page 227

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **012**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 36   **Starting Line #** 52   **Section** 4

Add the following acronym:

"OID Object Identifier"

Reason
Used on page 230

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **013**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 37   **Starting Line #** 62   **Section** 4

The last 3 acronyms are out of order

Reason
out of order

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

by 10

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **014**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 38   **Starting Line #** 16   **Section** 5

Change "specified:the" to "specified: the"

Reason

space missing

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **015**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 38   **Starting Line #** 56   **Section** 5.1.2.1

Change "QoS" to "Quality of Service (QoS)'

Reason

Using "QoS" for the first time.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **016**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 39   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section** 5.1.3.1

Change "7 bytes" to "6 bytes"
Make the same change for page 40, line 4 as well.

Reason
New MAC header has 6 bytes.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by** CE

Remove field sizes as they are not important here. Change "Overhead" "ATM CL header"
Add definition for ATM CL-header

Reason for Recommendation
The suggested fix does not address the entire problem. Also we have defined all header is our table format.

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

 replace 5.1.2-5.1.4.2 with the file "comment16.fm"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **017**   **Comment submitted by:** Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 41   **Starting Line #** 2   **Section** 5.1.4.2

It would be useful to include a protocol reference model that will describe where the ATM UNI (ATM NNI) and the IWF exists for the BS and the SS.

Reason

To help reader.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by** CE

No specific input was offered. Editor agrees that figure might add clarity

{Once upon a time we had such a diagram, but it caused so much controversy we got rid of it. Do we introduce it again? -Ken Stanwood}

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **018**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 42   **Starting Line #** 27   **Section**

p42 l 27.5; remove the extra period

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3a   **Comment Date**

Comment # 019   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 42   **Starting Line #** 41   **Section** 6.1.1.2.4

{Note: the comment applies to D2. It is Scott Marin's Comment 1057 from LB#3 and was not previously considered.}

After "appropriate agorithms" insert, e.g. [state an appropriate agoriithm].

Reason

What does "appropriate algorithms" mean? The text is very vague. Perhaps text should be added that states an example of one appropriate algorithm.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

On page 56 line 11 delete "..., and enters the CID into approproriate algorithms"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **020**   **Comment submitted by:** Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 43   **Starting Line #** 12   **Section** 5.2.2

Delete the "ingress Classifier" from figures 10 and 11.

Reason

There is no definition of this term in the text. The only remark is that it is "Vendor specific", no operations with this entity are assumed so this is out of the scope of the Air Interface Standard.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by** CE

Also remove the text "IEEE 802.3/Ethernet CS" from figures 11 and 10 (four instances in all)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace "Ingress classifier (....) " with "Reconstitution (e.g. undo PHS)"
Also remove the text "IEEE 802.3/Ethernet CS " from figures 11 and 10 (4 instances in all)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **021**   **Comment submitted by:** Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 44   **Starting Line #** 35   **Section** 5.2.3

Change

"If a Classifier is found in which all parameters match the packet, the Classifier shall forward the packet to the corresponding Connection. If no Classifier is found in which all parameters match the packet then the packet is delivered under vendor or operator specific conditions."

to the following text

"If a Classifier is found in which all parameters match the packet, the Classifier shall copy the packet to the corresponding Connection. If no Classifier is found in which all parameters match the packet then the packet is delivered under vendor or operator specific conditions."

Reason

Changing "forward" to "copy" allows to clarify the situation when the packet has to be delivered to several destinations (broadcast or multicast)

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by** CE

Change to "... corresponding Connection(s). "

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Keep the original wording but change "corresponding connection" to "corresponding connection(s)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 022   **Comment submitted by:**   Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 54   **Starting Line #** 25   **Section** 6.1.1.1.2

Change "service type"
to
"scheduling service type"

Reason

This is the exact term from 6.2.5

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted-Clarified**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Also change on line 42

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Clarified**

as per recommendation

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **023**   **Comment submitted by:** Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 54   **Starting Line #** 37   **Section** 6.1.1.1.2

Swap "sequence number" and "ARQ parameters"

Same about their specification at page 55, line 10

Reason

It is logical for the sequence number to appear at the last place, afer all the connection parameters

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Ordering of logical interface has no impact, so if no one objects, we should use Vladimir's ordering.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **024**   **Comment submitted by:**   Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 54   **Starting Line #** 50   **Section** 6.1.1.1.2

Change "The traffic parameters"
to "The service flow parameters"

Reason

According to the list of the primitive parameters

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 025   **Comment submitted by:**   Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 54   **Starting Line #** 58   **Section** 6.1.1.1.2

Change "The length indicator specifies whether the SDUs on the Service Flow are fixed-length or variable-length."
to
"Packing on/off indicator,specifies whether packing may be applied to the MAC SDUs on this connection
The Fixed-length or variable-length SDU indicator specifies whether the SDUs on the Service Flow are fixed-length or variable-length."

Reason

Packing on/off indicator specification was missed.
There is "Fixed-length or variable-length SDU indicator ", not "length indicator" in the list of parameters.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **026**   **Comment submitted by:**   Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 63   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section**   6.2.1

Remove
"These messages are carried in Ethernet packets as specified in 5.2.5.1."

Reason

This sentence seems requesting from 802.16 conformant system to carry messages of IP based management protocol in Ethernet format.
Such a request is too restrictive because a system not necessarily has an Ethernet interface between Convergence Sublayer and upper
layers. The messages of DHCP, TFTP, SNMP might travel in the Internet end to end without a single transformation into the Ethernet
format.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Clarified**   **Recommendation by** CE

Discuss in group

Reason for Recommendation

Mandating Ethernet seems unnecessary .

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Carl provides the input

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **0 2 7**   **Comment submitted by:** Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 67   **Starting Line #** 6   **Section** 6.2.2.1.1

Delete the following text fragments from the Table 3

For type = 0x03
"code may be reused for some DL only purpose"

For type = 0x04
"(not needed simultaneously with packing sub-header)"

For type = 0x05
"code may be reused for some DL only purpose"

Reason
These are comments for the developers of the standard, not for the readers

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace p 67 lines 1-25 with contents of file "comment027.fm"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 028   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 67   **Starting Line #** 11   **Section**   6.2.2.1.1

Add "(UL only, code may be reused for some DL only purpose)" in description column.

Reason

Clarity. Consistency with lines 15 and 20.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **029**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 68   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section** 6.2.2.1.2

On page 68, line 3, add the line "f) UGS and UGS/AD connections may use the bandwidth request type code "000010" which requests a change to the active Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate, bounded by the admitted Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate."

On page 68, line 21 add the qualifier "Type = 000000 or 000001" in the Description field below the line "Bandwidth Request"

On page 68, after line 22 add "Type = 000010   The requested active Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate in kbits per second"

On page 70, line 8, change "UGS" to "UGS ll USG/AD".

On page 70, Delete lines17-24.

on page 70, Delete lines 41-44.

On page 115, line 1 change "grants per Nominal Grant Interval" to "bandwidth"

On page 115, line 1 change "Grants Per Interval" to "Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate"

On page 115, line 4 delete the last sentence of the paragraph.

On page 115, line 48, change "Nominal Grant Interval, the Tolerated Grant Jitter" to "Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate"

On page 115, line 51, change "grants in the first (and/or second) grant interval" to "bandwidth"

On page 115, line 53, change "a total of one grant for each grant interval" to "total bandwidth as if the allocation started"

On page 115, line 54, delete from ",plus one additional" through the end of the next sentence.

On page 115, line 60 to page 116, line 5 replace the entire paragraph with "The Grant Management subheader is used as in the UGS case.

On page 157, lines 45-57 replace all 6 occurrances of "Grants Per Interval" with "Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate"

On page 157, lines 49, 51, and 56 replace all 3 occurrances of "one" with "to that required for one higher layer flow"

On page 157, line 56 replace "four" with "to that required for four higher layer flows"

On page 343, delete line 21 through page 345, line 15.

Reason

The whole "grants per interval" concept is a hokey way to accomplish what real communications systems accomplish by setting peak rates. We already have the concept of peak rate in the "Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate" parameter. Everything sorrounding grants per interval is redundant with other more traditional QoS parameters we already have. There is nothing you can do with the grants per interval scheme that you can't do with the traditional scheme. In fact, the grants per interval scheme starts breaking down as the link gets loaded. Additionally, page 157 already explains how to use teh DCD messages to expand and contract UGS and UGS/AD without the grants per interval in the GM. If quicker turn around tme is needed, we should add a special type code for the Bandwidth Request Header that, rather than asking for a discrete amount of bandwidth asks for a change in the active Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate (bounded of course by the admitted).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** Accepted-Modified

On page 37, delete line 50

On page 70, Delete lines17-24.

on page 70, Delete lines 41-44.

On page 114, delete lines 17.

On page 114, line 36, delete "Unsolicited Grant Service with Activity Detection (UGS/AD),"

On page 115, line 1 change "grants per Nominal Grant Interval" to "bandwidth"

On page 115, line 1 change "Grants Per Interval" to "Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate"

On page 115, line 4 delete the last sentence of the paragraph.

On page 115, delete lines 28 through page 116, line 6.

On page 157, lines 45-57 replace with
"For example, if an upper layer service were using unsolicited grant service, and the addition of upper-layer flows could be adequately provided by increasing the Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate QoS parameter, then the following might be used. When the first higher layer flow is pending, the SS issues a DSA-REQ with the admitted Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate parameter equal to that required for one higher layer flow, and the active Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate parameter equal zero. Later when the higher layer flow becomes active, it issues a DSC-REQ with the instance of the active Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate parameter equal to to that required for one higher layer flow. Admission control was performed at the time of the reservation, so the later DSC-REQ, having the active parameters within the range of the previous reservation, is guaranteed to succeed. Subsequent higher layer flows would be handled in the same way. If there were three higher layer flows establishing connections, with one flow already active, the Service Flow would have admitted Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate equal to that required for four higher layer flows, and active Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate equal to that required for one higher layer flow."
On page 304, line 33 add a level 4 section titled "Tolerated Poll Jitter" with body text " For the 10-66 GHz PHY, the minimum value of the Tolerated Poll Jitter (see section 11.4.11.18) shall be 3000 usec.

On page 341, line 53, changes the meaning of value 5 to "reserved".

On page 342, line 33, delete "UGS-AD,"

On page 343, delete line 21 through page 345, line 15.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

 Comment # **030**   **Comment submitted by:**   Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 68   **Starting Line #** 37   **Section**   6.2.2.2

Delete 6.2.2.2 and renumber following sections.

Reason

Redundant with 6.2.2.3.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Delete lines 49-56

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **031**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 68   **Starting Line #** 43   **Section** 6.2.2.2

Change "Fragmentation" to "Grant Management"

Reason

Per Figure 28 on page 109, the Grant Management subheader is pre-pended after the Fragmentation subheader is already attached to the SDU.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 032   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 68   **Starting Line #** 45   **Section** 6.2.2.2

Add the sentence: "The Packing subheader and the Fragmentation subheader are mutually exclusive and shall not both be present within the same MAC PDU."

Reason

Clarity. This is implied in Table 3.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **033**   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 68   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section** 6.2.2.2

Change 'Ifpresent' to 'If present'

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **0 3 4**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 68   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section** 6.2.2.2

Change "Ifpresent" to "If present"

Reason

Missing space.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 035   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 70   **Starting Line #** 48   **Section**   6.2.2.3.2

At the end of line 48 add "Piggy-Back Requests are always incremental."

Reason

Clarity. This is stated later in the document, but it would help if it were here, too.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **036**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 71   **Starting Line #** 6   **Section** 6.2.2.3.3

Change word 'illustrated ' to 'defined'

Reason
The table defines the format

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3 a   **Comment Date**

Comment # 037   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 71   **Starting Line #** 19   **Section** 6.2.2.3.3

Change "MAC SDU Length" to "Length"

Reason

Field name shall be spelled exactly.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **038**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 71   **Starting Line #** 50   **Section** 6.2.2.4

Change '.MAC' to 'MAC'

Reason

Sounds too much like '.NET'

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **039**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 71   **Starting Line #** 50   **Section** 6.2.2.4

Change ".MAC" to "MAC"

Reason

Extra period.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 040   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 71   **Starting Line #** 50   **Section** 6.2.2.4

Change ".MAC" to "MAC"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **041**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 71   **Starting Line #** 55   **Section** 6.2.2.4

Delete the sentence starting "The internal format of the CS..."

Reason

This section does not talk about convergence sublayer messages, so the statement is out of place.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Sentence is true but truely out of place.

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **042**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 72   **Starting Line #** 4   **Section** 6.2.2.4

Remove "(optonal)".

Reason

For MAC Management messages, the payload is not optional like it is for CS messages. It must have at least the message type code.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 64 line 15 change "Message" to "MAC PDU"
On page 72 delete everything on lines 2-11 from the figure 27.
On page 71 line 53 - 55 replace first three sentences with
" A set of MAC Management Messages are defined. These messages shall be carried in the Payload of the MAC PDU. All MAC Management Messages begin with a Management Message Type field and may contain additional fields. MAC Management Messages on the Basic, Broadcast and Initial Ranging connections shall neither be fragmented nor packed. MAC Management Messages on the Primary Management Connection may be packed and/or fragmented. "

On page 66 line 5 change "0" to "msb" rotated 90 degrees
On page 66 line 5 delete "8"
On page 66 line 5 change "15" to "lsb" rotated 90 degrees

On page 67 line 35 change "0" to "msb" rotated 90 degrees
On page 67 line 35 delete "8"
On page 67 line 35 change "15" to "lsb" rotated 90 degrees

On page 64 line 30 at the left hand side of the diagram insert "MSB" rotated 90 degrees
On page 64 line 30 at the right hand side of the diagram insert "LSB" rotated 90 degrees

Starting on page 74 delete the Generic_MAC_Header() row from table 12 through 20 , 22,23, 37-58.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 043   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 73   **Starting Line #** 42   **Section** 6.2.2.4.1

Change 'modulo the field size' to 'modulo 256'
Make same change on page 75 line 56

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **044**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 75   **Starting Line #** 12   **Section** 6.2.2.4.1

On page 75 line 12 and again on page 76, line 12 add the following sentence: "Burst Descriptor contents are defined separately for each PHY mode in section 8."

Reason

Clarity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **0 4 5**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 76   **Starting Line #** 21   **Section** 6.2.2.4.3

Delete the line "Length" and move the next 3 lines to the end of line 15. Before moving the 3 lines, change (on line 22) "Length field" to "LEN field"

Reason

"Length" is not a parameter of DL-MAP.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

Delete line 21
Append lines 22-25 to line 15.
In the appended text change 'Length field' to 'LEN field'

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:　　　　　　　　　**Ballot Number: 3 a**　　　　　　　　　　　**Comment Date**

Comment # 046　　　**Comment submitted by:** Stanley　　　Wang　　　　　　　　Observer

Change　　　**Type** Technical, Non-binding　　　**Starting Page #** 76　　**Starting Line #** 30　　**Section** 6.2.2.4.3

Add the following parameter:

"DCD Count
 Matchs the value of the Configuration Change COunt of the DCD, which describes the burst parameters that apply to this map."

Boldface the first line. Also on line 49, ass the following corresponding parameter to the table:

"| DCD Count | 8 bits | |"

Reason

DCD Count is needed for sychronization purpose.

Proposed Resolution　　　**Recommendation:**　　　　　　　　**Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group　　　　　　**Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do the proposed change
Also on line 31 and 50 Change '64 bit' with '48 bit'

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Necessity and the desire to reduce overhead

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **047**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 76   **Starting Line #** 56   **Section**   6.2.2.4.3

On page 76, line 56 properly indent "DL_MAP..."
On page 76, line 56 add "Variable" to the Size column
On page 76, line 56 add "See corresponding PHY spec." to the Notes column
On page 76, line 57 add a row with "}" to cloe out line 55
On page 77, line 29 properly indent "UL_MAP..."

Reason

Correct typo in Table 14. Consistency with Table 15.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3 a

Comment Date

Comment # 048   **Comment submitted by:** Antonis   Karvelas

| **Change** | **Type** Editorial | **Starting Page #** 79 | **Starting Line #** 17 | **Section** 6.2.2.4.6 |

Replace the "The RNG-RSP Message shall be transmitted using the burst profile in the UL-MAP, …" with the "The RNG-RSP Message shall be transmitted using the burst profile in the DL-MAP, …"

Reason

The RNG-RSP message is sent by the BS in the downlink, so it uses the burst profile in the DL-MAP message, not the UL-MAP message.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Do suggested change but also change "The RNG-RSP" to "The initial RNG-RSP"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **049**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 80   **Starting Line #** 6   **Section** 6.2.2.4.6

Insert a new field : "Uplink operational burst profile : the SS uplink operational burst profile"

Reason

It is not described in the standard the process by which the SS selects its uplink operational burst profile. I believe that the ranging process can be used by BS to assign the SS its uplink operational burst profile. Specifically the BS, based on measurements from the physical layer when it receives the RNG-REQ message from the SS, can decide what would be the better uplink operational burst profile for the SS.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do not do the suggested change but:

On page 80 line 6 change "Granted downlink burst type" to "Downlink Operational Burst Profile" and make it boldface
On page 311 line 43 change "Granted downlink burst type" to "Downlink Operational Burst Profile"
On page 311 line 45 change "the DIUC to be used" to "the least robust DIUC that may be used"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The BS controls the operational UIUC by mandating it in th UL-MAP message.

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 050   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical (was Editorial)   **Starting Page #** 80   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section** 6.2.2.4.7

Remove the HMAC Digest field.

Reason

Based on section "11.4.12 HMAC-Digest" the scope of the HMAC Digest doesn't include the REG-REQ message.
Generally it is not clear in the standard what the SS is responsible to do as concern as the authentication in the case the SS doesn't
support privacy.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Don't do what is requested but instead

p. 104 line 23 Add a row to table 51"TLV encoded information | variable| |"
p. 104 on line 26 add text
" The RES-CMD shall include the following parameters encoded as TLV tuples:
    HMAC Tuple (see 11.4.12)
        The HMAC Tuple shall be the last attribute in the message. "
Make HMAC Tuple boldface

p. 107 line 25 replace row in table 55 with "TLV encoded information | variable| |"
p. 107 on line 30 add text
" The DREG-CMD shall include the following parameters encoded as TLV tuples:
        HMAC Tuple (see 11.4.12)
            The HMAC Tuple shall be the last attribute in the message. "
Make HMAC Tuple boldface
p. 108 line 27 Add a row to table 57 "TLV encoded information | variable| |"
p. 108 on line 36 add text
" The TFTP-CPLT shall include the following parameters encoded as TLV tuples:
    HMAC Tuple (see 11.4.12)
        The HMAC Tuple shall be the last attribute in the message "
Make HMAC Tuple boldface

.

p 92 l. 50-53 change*3 "-Digest" to " Tuple"
p 92 l. 52 change "is" to "contains"

p 94 l. 7-10 change*3 "-Digest" to " Tuple"
p 94 l. 8 change "is" to "contains"

p 95 l. 25-28 change*3 "-Digest" to " Tuple"
p 95 l. 26 change "is" to "contains"

p 96 l. 20-23 change*3 "-Digest" to " Tuple"
p 96 l. 21 change "is" to "contains"

p 97 l. 27-30 change*3 "-Digest" to " Tuple"
p 97 l. 29 change "is" to "contains"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Authentication and key exchange are mandatory features

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 051   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 81   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 6.2.2.4.8

Replace the sentence "The CID in the Generic MAC Header is the Basic CID for this SS." with "The CID in the Generic MAC Header is the Primary Management CID for this SS."

Reason

The REG-RSP message uses the Primary Management CID based on Table 11.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 052   **Comment submitted by:** Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 81   **Starting Line #** 29   **Section** 6.2.2.4.8

Change "The CID in the Generic MAC Header is the Basic CID for this SS"
to
"The CID in the Generic MAC Header is the Primary Management CID for this SS"

Reason
This is inconsistent with Table 11-MAC Management Messages - where REG-RSP is sent on Primary Management CID.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **053**   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 81   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section** 6.2.2.4.7

Change '1=Authentication Failure' to '1=Message authentication failure' . Delete '2=CoS Failure'

Reason

The SS is already authenticated at registration time. Since SFs are nbo longer included in the REG-REQ there is no basis for CoS failure whatever it means.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **0 5 4**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 81   **Starting Line #** 43   **Section**   6.2.2.4.8

Insert the sentence "Network Access Control Object (see 11.4.3)".

Reason

At section "6.2.9.9 Registration" the standard says that "The REG-RSP message shall include the Secondary Management CID and the Network Access Control Object 11.4.3." but the Network Access Control Object is not included in the definition of the RNG-RSP message.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 73 line 29 Change "De-register" to "De/Re-register"
On page 106 replace line 50 through page 107 line 30 with contents of file "comment054.fm"
On page 327-328 delete section 11.4.3
On page 141 line 20 delete "and the Network Access Control Object 11.4.3"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **055**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 82   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 6.2.2.4.9

The REG-ACK message doesn't serve a specific goal and must removed from the standard.

Reason

The REG-ACK message was essential in the IEEE 802.16.1/D1 - 2000 version of the standard when the REG-REQ message from the SS included the Uplink and Downlink Service Flow Configuration Setting.
But now during the Registration process the SS doesn't send the Service Flow Encodings, so the text "A Registration Acknowledge message shall be transmitted by the SS in response to a REG-RSP from the BS. It confirms acceptance by the SS of the QoS parameters of the flow as reported by the BS in it REG-RSP." is invalid for the current version of the standard because the REG-RSP doesn't contain QoS parameters of the SS's service flows.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

Page 72 line 42 change line "8 l REG-ACK l Registration acknowledge lPrimary managementl" to "8l l reserved l l"
Delete on page 82 section 6.2.2.4.9 and it's contents

Replace page 141 line 35 through 144 line 27 with contents of file "comment 55.fm"

Page 159 line 13 remove "Registration ACK " from figure together with arrow.
Page 302 delete lines 33-35 (timeout for REG-ACK")
Page 335 line 24 Delete "REG-ACK,"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **056**   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 82   **Starting Line #** 4   **Section** 6.2.2.4.9

Delete line 'It confirms....'

Reason

SF QoS parameters are not known at this time.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 057   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 84   **Starting Line #** 33   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10

On page 84, delete lines 33-37.
On page 85, line 1 delete the subsentence starting "a particular Security Association..."
On page 85, delete lines 13-16
On page 90 delete line 36 through page 91, line 47.
On page 324, delete line 54 through page 325 line 12

Reason
The PKM MAP messages are no longer needed now that the SA is in the DSA messages

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**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 058   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 84   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10

Change "e.g.," to "i.e.,"

Reason

This is not an example.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Page 84 line 47 change " The SS shall ...)" to "The SS shall increment (modulo 256) "

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **059**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 84   **Starting Line #** 54   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10

Change "may be set" to "shall be set"

Reason

This is not an option.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **0 6 0**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 85   **Starting Line #** 4   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10

Change "Request" to "Requests"
Make the same changes for lines 9 and 13.

Reason

Maybe more one pending.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change paragraph on page 85 lines 4-7 to read
"An SS shall keep track of the Identifier of its latest, pending Authorization Request. The SS shall discard Authorization Reply and
Authorization Reject messages with Identifier fields not matching that of the pending Authorization Request. "
Change paragraph on page 85 lines 9-12 to read
"An SS shall keep track of the Identifiers of its latest, pending Key Request for each SA. The SS shall discard Key Reply and Key Reject
messages with Identifier fields not matching those of the pending Key Request messages. "

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **061**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 85   **Starting Line #** 22   **Section**   6.2.2.4.10

Change "Length of the PKM packet." to "LEN field of the MAC PDU header."

Reason

There is no Length field for PKM messages.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 062   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 85   **Starting Line #** 26   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10

Change "Packet formats" to "Formats"

Reason

They are not packets.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **063**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 85   **Starting Line #** 57   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.1

Add reference for X.509 at first use; possibly also in later usage.
Is [RFC-2459] the appropriate reference?

Reason
Need to tell people what X.509 is.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

Add reference to section 7.6

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Section 7.6 section desribes the certificate and references RFC 2459

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 064   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 86   **Starting Line #** 2   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.1

Change the last sentence of the paragraph to read "This includes the data encryption and data authentication algorithms the SS supports."

Reason

Avoid unnecessary modifications of the spec in the future.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 065   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 86   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.2

Change the Contents column to read "Authorization Key's active lifetime"

Reason

Otherwise it can be confused with "Authorization Key Lifetime" which is a BS system parameter defined in Table 106. Active lifetime is a better description of the meaning of the parameter, which specifies the lifetime the AK remains active.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **066**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 86   **Starting Line #** 54   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.3

Change the title of the Table to read "Authorization Reject Attributes"

Reason
Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **067**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 87   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.4

Delete row with 'SS Identification' from table 28

Reason

The SS Identification is done based on the CID

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **068**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 87   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.4
Delete line 18.

Reason
SS Identifier no longer needed here.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **069**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 87   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.4

Delete the entire row for "SS-Identification"

Reason

Using CID instead of SS-ID.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **070**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 90   **Starting Line #** 39   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.10

Change "Section c)" to "Section 7.3.3" and fix the cross-reference. Make the same change on page 90 line 63 and page 91 line 25.

Reason

Typo.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **071**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 90   **Starting Line #** 53   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.10

Delete row with 'SS Identification' from table 34

Reason

The SS Identification TLVs have been removed

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 072   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 90   **Starting Line #** 53   **Section** 6.2.2.4.10.10

If the PKM MAP messages are kept:

On page 90, delete line 53.
On page 90, line 55 delete "downlink"
On page 91, line 12 delete "downlink"

Reason

SS-identification no longer needed.
Messages are valid for UL flows, too.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   Decision of Group: Superceded

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **073**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 92   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section** 6.2.2.4.11

On page 92, line 47; on page 93, line 57; and on page 97, line 14 add:
"Convergence Sulayer Parameter Encodings (see 11.4.16)
      Specification of the Service Flow's convergence sublayer specific parameters"

Reason

Completeness

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

On page 92, line 47; on page 93, line 57; and on page 97, line 14 add:
"Convergence Sublayer Parameter Encodings (see 11.4.16)
      Specification of the Service Flow's convergence sublayer specific parameters"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a** Comment Date

Comment # **074** Comment submitted by: Antonis Karvelas

Change **Type** Technical, Non-binding Starting Page # 93 Starting Line # 3 Section 6.2.2.4.11.2

Replace the sentence :
"BS-initiated DSA-Requests for Uplink Service Flows shall also include a Connection ID."
with the following :
"BS-initiated DSA-Requests shall also include a Connection ID."

Reason
The SS needs the CID not only for Uplnik Service Flows but also for Downlink Service Flows (to search in the downlink for MAC PDUs that belongs to its downlink service flows).

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **075**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 93   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section**   6.2.2.4.11.2

On page 90, line 3 delete "Uplink"

Reason

The BS provides a CID for DL connections, too.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **076**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 93   **Starting Line #** 9   **Section** 6.2.2.4.11.2

On page 93, line 9 add "BS-initiated DSA-Requests shall also include the SA-Descriptor for the service flow."
On page 94, line 18 add "The BS's DSA-response shall also include the SA-Descriptor for the service flow."

Reason

Agreed to last meeting

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **077**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 105   **Starting Line #** 46   **Section**   46

Change 'registration respone' to 'SBC-RSP'

Reason
Cut'n'paste bug

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **078**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 107   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section** 6.2.2.4.30

Change the text :
"The Dynamic Service Addition Received Message shall be generated by the BS in response to an SS-initiated DSx-REQ to inform the SS that the BS has received the DSx-REQ message in a more timely manner than provided by the DSx-RSP message, which may only be transmitted after the DSx-REQ is authenticated. The format of the DSx-RVD shall be as shown in Table 56."
to :
"The Dynamic Service Addition/Change Received Message shall be generated by the BS in response to an SS-initiated DSx-REQ (x=A or C) to inform the SS that the BS has received the DSx-REQ (x=A or C) message in a more timely manner than provided by the DSx-RSP (x=A or C) message, which may only be transmitted after the DSx-REQ (x=A or C) is authenticated. The format of the DSx-RVD (x=A or C) shall be as shown in Table 56."

Reason
It must be clear that we have two messages :
DSA-RVD for SS-Initiated Dynamic Service Addition
DSC-RVD for SS-Initiated Dynamic Service Change

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **079**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 107   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section** 6.2.2.4.30

On page 107, line 34 change "Addition" to "Message"
On page 107, line 38 change "DSx-RVD" to "DSX-RVD"
On page 107, line 46 change "DSA" to "DSX"

Reason
Typos

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **080**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 108   **Starting Line #** 41   **Section** 6.2.2.4.32

On page 108, line 41 change "CLPLT" to "CPLT"
On page 108, line 49 change "CPLT" to "RSP"

Reason

Typos

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **081**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 110   **Starting Line #** 60   **Section** 6.2.3.4

Change "merge" to "pack"

Reason

This is the packing section, not the merging section. Let's not add a new term with subtly different meaning.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 082   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 111   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section** 6.2.3.4.1

Replace paragraph with

"For connections that are indicated, by the parameter <ref to 11.4.11.24> , to carry fixed length MAC SDUs the packing procedure described in this section may be used. In this case the Request/Transmission Policy <ref to 11.4.11.17> shall be set to allow packing and prohibit fragmentation and the SDU size <ref 11.4.11.25> shall be included in DSA-REQ message when establishing the connection.

The SDUs are packed into the payolad of the MAC PDU without Packing Sub-headers. This is illustrated in <ref to fig 30>. If the MAC SDU size equals n bytes, the receiveing side can unpack the MAC PDU payload as the size of it will be k*n, where k is the number of MAC SDUs packed into the PDU. "

Reason
Current text is wrong as the length of the header is included in LEN field

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood
Insert the above paragraph in front of the one that currently exists, rather than replacing it. Let comment 083 take care of length issue.

Reason for Recommendation
The above text adds good information, but does not replace valuable (once corrected) text in the existing paragraph.

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Replace first 2 sentences (lines 3-6) with
"For connections that are indicated, by the parameter <ref to 11.4.11.24> , to carry fixed length MAC SDUs the packing procedure described in this section may be used. In this case the Request/Transmission Policy <ref to 11.4.11.17> shall be set to allow packing and prohibit fragmentation and the SDU size <ref 11.4.11.25> shall be included in DSA-REQ message when establishing the connection. "

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 083   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 111   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section** 6.2.3.4.1
Change the first field to read "n*k+6" instead of "n*6" and make the same change on line 28.

Reason
The LEN field includes the size of MAC header, which is 6 bytes.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood
Also make the change on line 8.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

On line 8 change "k*n" to "n*k+j" and "...into the MAC PDU" and "...into the MAC PDU and j is the size of the MAC header and any prepended MAC Sub-headers. "
line 18 Change the first field to read "n*k+j" instead of "n*k" and make the same change on line 28.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **0 8 4**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 113   **Starting Line #** 40   **Section**   6.2.3.6

Change "Recall" to "Note"

Reason

It hasn't be discussed before.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **085**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 114   **Starting Line #** 52   **Section** 6.2.5.1

Change 'The key service information elements are ' to read
'The Unsolicited grant service shall be specified using the following parameters: '

Reason
The current wording is too vague.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **086**   **Comment submitted by:**   Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 115   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 6.2.5

Delete the whole paragraph "The BS shall not allocate ... with UGS service"

Delete the whole paragraph that from line 51 to line 57 p.115 "In USG-AD service ... a DSC command"

Delete the following text, line 23 p. 116:

"Minimum Reserved Traffic Rate, Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate", "Traffic Priority."

Delete the following text, line 35 p. 116:

"Minimum Reserved Traffic Rate, Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate", "Traffic Priority."

Reason

As a general approach, Air Interface Standard specifies MAC signaling (including the signaling related to the capacity request/allocation) but does NOT specify algorithms/policy of the capacity allocation.
The section 6.2.5 describes "basic uplink service flow scheduling services". These are services provided for the scheduling itself, not for the data transfer. When BS allocates capacity for the Reservation Request expected from SS, - it is scheduling service. When BS allocates capacity for the data transfer - it is data transfer service.

So any prescription on how BS decides on allocation of grants should be deleted from the text.

Minimum Reserved Traffic Rate, Maximum Sustained Traffic Rate, Traffic Priority.are the parameters of data delivery, not of the scheduling process.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Superceded**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

I recommend that the first two items be superceded by comments 029 and 087.

The last two items should be rejected.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

  Comment # 087   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 115   **Starting Line #** 4   **Section**

Delete sentence ' The active ....'

Reason
We have no active grants field

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood
Duplicate of a piece of comment 029.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 088   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 115   **Starting Line #** 39   **Section**   6.2.5.3

Delete the sentence in parenthesis starting "The BS can detect..." Through the word "However," of the following sentence.

Reason

Debatable whether the first sentence is true. Since it's informative and the second sentence says what we need to say, it's best to delete the first sentence.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **089**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 117   **Starting Line #** 22   **Section** 6.2.6.1

I believe that the GPC mode must be removed because it offers no advantage.

Reason

The GPC mode spends much bandwidth in the downlink when we have a large number of connections because the BS must send resource allocations for each connection.
Also the use of a SS local scheduler is useful because it knows the real -time needs of each connection so it can more efficiently allocate the bandwidth to the individual connections.
Also the deletion of the GPC mode will help the interoperability.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by** CE

Discuss with group

{While I agree with Antonis, we should discuss this with TG3/TG4 first. -Ken Stanwood}

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace the paragraph starting on line 31 " Systems using the 10-66 GHz PHY defined in section 8.2 shall use GPSS mode."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **090**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 117   **Starting Line #** 26   **Section**   6.2.6.1

change "UL maps and more intelligent" to "UL maps and allows more intelligent"

Reason
grammar

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **091**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 118   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 6.2.6.2

Check to see whether this resolution from LB#3 (applied to D2) was correctly implemented:

On page 111, lines 4-35 replace the upper right 2 boxes and 3 decision diamonds in Figure 65 (after implementation of comment 739) with the same portion of Figure 66 (after implementation of comment 521).

Reason

To confirm completeness of resolution of Comment 790 from LB#3.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Superceded**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

The figure appears to be correct.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3 a   **Comment Date**

Comment # 092   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 124   **Starting Line #** 62   **Section** 6.2.7.2

Add to end of paragraph: "Note that operation with half-duplex terminals is both FDD and TDD, since the uplink and downlink transmissions are separated in both time and frequency."

Reason

Clarification of a confusing point.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

In the case of half duplex FDD the link is still FDD.

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **093**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 125   **Starting Line #** 10   **Section** 6.2.7.2
Redraw Figures 40 and 111 in frame maker.

Reason
They don't print correctly on some PCs.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **094**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 125   **Starting Line #** 62   **Section** 6.2.7.3

Change "In the case of TDD, the uplink and downlink transmissions share the same frequency, but are separated in time. "

to

Change "In the case of TDD, the uplink and downlink transmissions occur at different times but may share the same frequency."

Reason

Compatibility with definition of TDD proposed here and used in 802.16.2/D3-2001 ("A duplex scheme where uplink and downlink transmissions occur at different times but may share the same frequency.")

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change to "In the case of TDD, the uplink and downlink transmissions occur at different times and usually share the same frequency."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **095**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 127   **Starting Line #** 7   **Section** 6.2.7.5.3.1
On page 127, delete lines 7-9.

Reason
Priority Request multicast CIDs don't exist anymore.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 096   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 127   **Starting Line #** 43   **Section** 6.2.7.5.3.5

Delete lines 43-47

Reason

Per the UIUC definitions in the PHY section, the Expansion IE doesn't exist, and if it did, its existance would be PHY dependant.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **097**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 129   **Starting Line #** 54   **Section** 6.2.8

Change "dependent of the CID" to "dependent on the CID"

Reason
grammar

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **098**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 130   **Starting Line #** 24   **Section** 6.2.8

On page 130 line 24 Replace the sentence 'The SS determines ... '   with 'The SS shall consider the contention transmission lost if no grant has been given in the stipulated number of UL-MAPs or within the time in which they were to be received.'

On page 122 line 40 Replace sentence ' If the BS... ' to 'The SS shall assume that the transmission has been unsuccessful if no grant has been received in the number of subsequent UL-MAP messages specified by the parameter < reference new entry in table 11.1.1.1>. Note that with a frame based PHY with UL-MAPs occurring at predetermined instants errenous UL-MAPs may be counted towards this number.'

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 130 line 24 Replace the sentence 'The SS determines ... '   with 'The SS shall consider the contention transmission lost if no grant has been given in the stipulated number of UL-MAPs or within the time in which they were to be received.'

On page 122 line 40 Replace sentence ' If the BS... ' to 'The SS shall assume that the transmission has been unsuccessful if no grant has been received in the number of subsequent UL-MAP messages specified by the parameter Random Access Timeout<reference table in 11.1.1.1>. Note that with a frame based PHY with UL-MAPs occurring at predetermined instants errenous UL-MAPs may be counted towards this number.'

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **099**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 130   **Starting Line #** 31   **Section** 6.2.8
On page 130, delete lines 31-34.
On page 300, delete lines 56-59

Reason
The decision to discard a PDU MUST be QoS and priority dependant, not arbitrarily set at 16 retries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a** **Comment Date**

Comment # **100** **Comment submitted by:** Antonis Karvelas

Change **Type** Editorial **Starting Page #** 134 **Starting Line #** 56 **Section** 6.2.9.3

Replace the box title "Establish IP Connectivity" with "Negotiate Basic Capabilities".

Reason

The Figure 48 must agree with Figure 47. The Figure 47 shows that after ranging the SS executes the "Negotiate Basic Capabilities" process.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Should also be redrawn/reimported into Framemaker

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **101**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 137   **Starting Line #** 38   **Section**   6.2.9.5

Change the sentence "allocate Basic, Primary Management, and Secondary Management Connection" as "allocate Basic and Primary Management Connection" in Figure 50.

Reason

The Secondary Management CID is given to the SS with the REG-RSP message and not the RNG-RSP message.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **102**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 137   **Starting Line #** 43   **Section** 6.2.9.5

Change the sentence "store Basic Connection ID & adjust other parameters" as "recognize own MAC Address, store Basic Connection ID & adjust other parameters" in Figure 50.

Reason

The SS recognizes the first RNG-RSP from the BS (that is own RNG-RSP message) using the SS MAC Address field of the RNG-RSP message. This information will help the reader.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 103   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 141   **Starting Line #** 11   **Section** 6.2.9.8

Delete "unless explicitly told not to"

Reason

Agreed last meeting that we always do authentication and key exchange.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **104**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 141   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section** 6.2.9.9

Change "manageable.To" to "manageable. To"

Reason

missing space

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a**   Comment Date

Comment # **105**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 141   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section** 6.2.9.9

Change "ageable.To" to "ageable. To"

Reason

Missing space.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **106**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 142   **Starting Line #** 26   **Section** 6.2.9.9

Last state should now be "Establish IP Connectivity" instead of "Operational"

Reason

Previously, we changed the order of initialization.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **107**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 146   **Starting Line #** 38   **Section** 6.2.10

Change "(re-range)\." to "(re-range)."

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a** **Comment Date**

Comment # 108 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member

Change **Type** Technical, Non-binding **Starting Page #** 148 **Starting Line #** 1 **Section** 6.2.10

In the periodic ranging process, insert into Figure 60 the case in which SS is already at its maximum (minimum) power and is not able to further increase (decrease) it. The SS should then use the "Ranging Anomalies" field in its ranging request by setting bit #0 (#1).

Reflect this change in Figure 51 also.

Reason

This change was accepted in Comment 553 of Letter Ballot #3, but change was not implemented and comment was marked "defer to next round".

Cited Reason: In order to avoid dead locks the SS must inform the BS when it has reached its limits.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation: Accepted** **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

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**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **109**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 148   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 6.2.10.1

On page 148, line 49 change "available,and" to "available, and"
On page 148, line 51 change "downlink,the" to "downlink, the"
On page 148, line 52 change "methods,the" to "methods, the"

Reason
missing spaces

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** Ken Stanwood

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **110**   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 151   **Starting Line #** 25   **Section** 6.2.11

Insert section from IEEE 802.16.1c-01/33 between 6.2.10 6.2.11

Reason

Issue needs to be clarified

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**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **111**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 154   **Starting Line #** 8   **Section** 6.2.11.3

Why is the authorized parameter set not known by the SS? We should communicate it somehow or we may get a lot of DSC messages from an SS that continuously get rejected.

Reason

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**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **112**   **Comment submitted by:**   Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 155   **Starting Line #** 4   **Section**   6.2.11.3

Figure 66 seems containing a statement that N connections may correspond to one Service Flow. This should be clarified.
(The author's opinion is that Service Flow should be defined as something associated with either 0 or 1 connection)

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

Change "0,N" to read "0,1" in figure 66 on line 6

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **113**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 156   **Starting Line #** 32   **Section** 6.2.11.5

On page 156, line 32 delete "receives all registration messages"
On page 156, line 42 delete "not only receives all registration messages, but"

Reason

The information in question is no longer in the registration messages.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **114**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 157   **Starting Line #** 22   **Section** 6.2.11.6.1

On page 157, line 22 delete the sentence starting ""The BS may deactivate..."
On page 157, line 28 delete the sentence starting ""The BS may deactivate..."

Reason

These sentences are not true. Services can be deleted at ay time.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3 a

Comment Date

Comment # 115   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 158   **Starting Line #** 29   **Section** 6.2.11.6.3

The standard says that : "These Service Flows are established at registration time and shall be authenticated by the BS MIC." but the BS MIC doesn't exist somewhere else in the standard.

Reason

To remove ambiguity.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Clarified**

page 158 line 26-31 Delete "This is the case.... " through the end of the paragraph. Merge the remaining sentence with the next paragraph

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 116   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 158   **Starting Line #** 42   **Section** 6.2.11.7.1

Replace the last 3 sentences of the paragraph with
"When this is complete, the BS passes service flow encodings to the SS in multiple DSA-REQ messages. The SS replies with DSA-RSP messages. The BS sends DSA-ACK messages to complete service flow initialization. This is shown in Figure 67."

Reason

The existing text had the old push from the SS model.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Replace the last 3 sentences of the paragraph with
"When this is complete, the BS passes service flow encodings to the SS in multiple DSA-REQ messages. The SS replies with DSA-RSP messages to complete service flow initialization. This is shown in Figure 67."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **117**   **Comment submitted by:**   Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 159   **Starting Line #** 33   **Section** 6.2.11.7.1

Change the direction of the last three messages at the Figure 67—Registration Message Flow

Reason

Figure 67 "Registration Message Flow "(p 159) illustrates the BS as the initiator of the DSA transactions for static SF's while
in the section 6.2.9.12.1 "Service Flow Setup" p 145 line 53 we find:

"After privacy is initialized, or after registration if privacy is disabled, the SS shall send DSA-REQ messages to the BS for to set up
connections for the service flows listed in the configuration file. The BS shall respond with the DSA-RSP message"

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 145, line 51 change "Service Flow Setup" to "Establish Provisioned Connections" and reduce the header level to H3.

On page 145, change lines 53 through 56 to say. After the transfer of operational parameters, the BS shall send DSA-REQ messages to the
BS to set up connections for pre-provisioned service flows belonging to the SS. The SS responds with DSA-RSP messages. This is
described further in section 6.2.11.7.1.

On page 145, delete line 58 through page 146, line 3.

On page 146, move lines 4-16 to page 138, line 10.

On page 146, delete lines 17-27.

On page 159, line 48, change "Registration Message Flow" to Provisioned Connection Establishment Message Flow"

On page 160, line 51. Between the DSA-Request and DSA-Response arrows, add an arrow from the BS to the SS labeled "RSX-RVD"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 118   **Comment submitted by:** Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 159   **Starting Line #** 35   **Section** 6.2.11.7.1

Change the direction arrows of DSA-REQ(mult), DSA-RSP(mult) and DSA-ACK(mult). The DSA-REQ(mult) is from SS to BS, the DSA-RSP(mult) is from BS to SS and the DSA-ACK(mult) is from SS to BS.

Reason

In static operation the SS passes the configuration information received from the provisioning server to the BS in multiple DSA-REQ messages.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **119**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 160   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 6.2.11.7.1

Delet lines 1-21.
delete lines 28-30.

Reason

This information is no longer in the Config File, and the config file is described elsewhere.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **120**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 166   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 6.2.11.8.2

We need to add the sending and receiving of the DSX-RVD message to Figures 72, 73, 74, and 75.
Also to Figures 79 and 83

Reason

They are incomplete.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Ken and Stanley to provide new diagrams

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **121**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 168   **Starting Line #** 12   **Section** 6.2.11.8.2

Change "DSA-RSP" to "DSC-RSP"

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 122   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 172   **Starting Line #** 10   **Section** 6.2.11.8.3.1

On page 172, after line 10 add the line "Set Timers T7 and T14" on the SS side.
On page 172, line 13 change "if" to "is"
On page 172, after line 28 add the line "Timer T7 Stops" on the SS side.
On page 172, line 39 change "can happen prior" to "happens prior"
On page 173, after line 18 add "Set Timer T7" to BS side
On page 173, after line 27 add "Timer T7 Stops" to BS side.

Reason
Clarity, completness and typos.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **1 2 3**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 174   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 6.2.11.8.3.3

Change the "Send RNG-RSP (abort)" to "Send DSA-REQ"

Reason

Erroneous text.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **124**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 174   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section** 6.2.11.8.3.3

Change "RNG-RSP (abort)" to "DSA-REQ"

Reason

cut and paste error

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **125**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 182   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section** 6.2.11.8.4

Change "connections" tp "connection"

Reason

gramar, the article "a" makes the noun singular with multiple mutually-exclusive adjectives

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **126**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 183   **Starting Line #** 12   **Section** 6.2.11.8.4.1

On page 183, after line 12 add the line "Set Timers T7 and T14" on SS side
On page 183, line 14 change "T12" to "T14"
On page 183, after line 22 add the line "Timer T7 Stops" to the SS side
On page 184, after line 11 add the line "Set Timer T7 " on BS side
On page 184, after line 18 add the line "Timer T7 Stops " on BS side
On page 185, add the seting of T14 in SS case
On page 186, add the reception of DSX-RVD in the SS case.
On page 190 add the sending of DSX-RVD in the BS case.

Reason

Completeness and fix typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do changes as specified on pages 183 &184
New figures will be provided for pages 185, 186 and 190

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Carl will provide new figures

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **127**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 183   **Starting Line #** 14   **Section** 6.2.11.8.4.1

Change the "Timer T12 Stops" to "Timer T14 Stops".

Reason

The right Timer here is the T14 not the T12 based on Table105.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **128**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 199   **Starting Line #** 38   **Section** 7.1.1

Change "MAC sublayer" to "MAC layer"

Reason

Change should have been made per comment #966.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **129**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type**   Editorial   **Starting Page #**   199   **Starting Line #**   55   **Section**   7.1.2

Change "; i.e.," to ", i.e.," make the same change on page 200 line 1.

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**   CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 130   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 199   **Starting Line #** 57   **Section** 7.1.2

Change "secret (i.e., an Authorization Key)" to "secret, i.e., an Authorization Key (AK),"

Reason

To establish the abbriviation to be used on next page.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **131**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 200   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 7.1.2

Delete "other identifying information; i.e.," and ", manufacturer ID and serial number" so that the beginning of the line reads "with SS MAC address."

Reason

Serial number is being removed from X.509 certificate (see line 7 page 232). Manufacturer ID is optional and is not included in X.509 (see 7.6.1.6). Note SS certificate is signed by the manufacturer so that the manufacturer's ID is implied.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **132**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 200   **Starting Line #** 37   **Section** 7.1.3

Change "traffic flows" to "service flows" and make the same change throughout the document including "traffic flow" to "service flow"

Reason
"service flow" is the correct term (see definition 3.40)

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **133**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 200   **Starting Line #** 37   **Section** 7.1.3

Change "multiple SS" to "multiple SSs"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **134**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 200   **Starting Line #** 44   **Section** 7.1.3

Change "an SAID" to "SAIDs"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **135**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 200   **Starting Line #** 48   **Section** 7.1.3

Change "must be" to "shall be"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 136   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 200   **Starting Line #** 57   **Section** 7.1.3

Change the sentence to read "Should the current keying material expire before a new set of keying material is received, the SS shall perform network entry as described in 6.2.9."

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **137**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 201   **Starting Line #** 7   **Section** 7.1.4

Change "in section (Table 7.3)" to "in Section 7.3" and fix the cross-reference

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

57

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **138**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 201   **Starting Line #** 8   **Section** 7.1.4
Change "PrimarySA" to "Primary SA"

Reason
Missing space.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 139   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 201   **Starting Line #** 26   **Section** 7.2.1

Change the last sentence to read "The rest of this Section provides an overview of the PKM protocol."

Reason

This section provides more than just the two state models.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Delete lines 20-26

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **140**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 201   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 7.2.2

Change the title of the section to capitalize the first character of each word.

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **141**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 201   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 7.2.2

Change the section from H3 to H4, i.e., 7.2.1.1. Correspondingly, change current "7.2.3" to "7.2.1.2"; change current "7.2.3.1" to "7.2.1.3"; and change "current "7.2.4" to "7.2.1.4" As a result, current "7.2.5" should become "7.2.2"

Reason

Incorrect section hierarchy.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

I see nothing wronfg with the current hierarchy

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **142**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 202   **Starting Line #** 19   **Section** 7.2.2

Change "will determine" to "shall determine"

Reason

This is not an option.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **143**   **Comment submitted by:**   Vladimir   Yanover

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 202   **Starting Line #** 19   **Section** 7.2.2

It is suggested to send the problem to MAC Group resolution

Reason

The quote frome the section 7.2.2

"The BS, in responding to an SS's Authorization Request, will determine whether the requesting SS, whose
identity can be verified via the X.509 digital certificate, is authorized for basic unicast services, and what
additional statically provisioned services (i.e., Static SAIDs) the SS's user has subscribed for"

Seems that at this moment (SS Authorization, see 6.2.9) there may be no knowledge yet at both BS and SS what are the services
provisioned for the SS or user of SS. If this is a real problem, so we have to split all the authorization process into
a) authorization of SS and b) [after the information on the provisioned services has been downloaded] authorization of each service for this
specific SS

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

I don't know what is wrong

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The BS has to upon establishing the identity of the SS retrieve information from some provisioning server.

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **144**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 203   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section** 7.2.3.1

Change the line to read "7.3 introduces Dynamic SAs and how a BS..." and fix the cross-reference.

Reason

Wrong section number (should be 7.3) and typo.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **145**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 203   **Starting Line #** 40   **Section** 7.2.3.1

Change "SS to request of the" to "SS to request the"

Reason
Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **146**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 203   **Starting Line #** 41   **Section** 7.2.3.1

Change "an multicast" to "a multicast"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **147**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 205   **Starting Line #** 7   **Section** 7.2.5

Change "Auth Reject (perm)" to "Perm Auth Reject" (two occurences)

Reason

This is a predefined "event" per 7.2.5.3 on page 208.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **148**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 205   **Starting Line #** 14   **Section** 7.2.5

Make "Auth Reply" normal font. Same change for line 23.

Reason

It is not a defined event (see 7.2.5.3 on page 207). It is a message received and should use normal font (per page 204 line 34).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do as suggested
Change on line 18 "Authent Request" to "Auth Request"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **149**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 205   **Starting Line #** 25   **Section** 7.2.5

Change "[TEK] Auth Stop" to "[TEK] Stop"

Reason

No such event called "Auth Stop"

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **1 5 0**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 206   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 7.2.5

Make all events ITALIC except event 4, which is not an event.

Reason

These are predefined events (per section 7.2.5.3) and should be ITALICed (per line 33 on page 204.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do the above and

Change p206 lines 15 and 43 "Provisioned" to "Communication Established"
Change on page 205 line ~4 "Provisioned" to "Communication Established"
Change on p 207 lines 50 and 53 (*2) "Provisioned" to "Communication Established"
p 209 line 13 Change "Provisioned" to "Communication Established"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 151   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 206   **Starting Line #** 52   **Section** 7.2.5.1

Change "(see Table 106)" to "(see Authorization Grace Time in Table 106)"

Reason

Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Do the above change and
p.206 line 52 Change "(see Table 106)" to "(see Authorization Grace Time in Table 106)"
p206 line 44 Replace " completed RF MAC registration " to "completed basic capabilities negotiation"
p207 line 52 Change "initialization,i.e., BS registration. If the RF MAC initialization" to "basic capabilities negotiation. If the basic capabilities negotiation"
p207 line 53 change "BS registration" to "basic capabilities negotiation"
p 222 line 6 change "MAC registration" to "basic capabilities negotiation"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **152**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 206   **Starting Line #** 62   **Section** 7.2.5.1

Add after "Request." the following sentence "The Authorization Reject's error code indicated the error was a permanent nature."

Reason

The transition takes place only if it is a permanent error.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 153   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 207   **Starting Line #** 5   **Section** 7.2.5.2

Change the entire section so that it doesn't start a new paragraph after each message name. For example, merger line 6 and line 8 into one paragraph, so that it reads "Authorization Request (Auth Request): Request an Authorization ..." Do it for all 5 messages.

Reason

Improve readability.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **154**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 207   **Starting Line #** 27   **Section** 7.2.5.2

Add a period to the end of the line.

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **155**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 209   **Starting Line #** 20   **Section** 7.2.5.5

Italic the event names inside of the parentheses on lines 20, 26, 33, and 39. For example, on line 20, "(Auth Reject)" should be ITALICed.

Reason

These are events and should be ITALICed (per page 204 line 33).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **156**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 211   **Starting Line #** 25   **Section** 7.2.6

Change "a SAID" to "an SAID"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **157**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 214   **Starting Line #** 6   **Section** 7.2.6.2

Use normal font for the message names on lines 6, 9, 15, and 20. For example, on line 6, "Key Request:" should not be ITALICed.

Reason
Per line 34 on page 204.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a**   Comment Date

Comment # 158   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 214   **Starting Line #** 21   **Section** 7.2.6.2

Change "a SAID" to "an SAID"

Reason

Typo.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **159**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 214   **Starting Line #** 48   **Section** 7.2.6.3

Change the line to read "encrypting BS, i.e., an SAID's"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

p214 line 48 Change instead to read "encrypting BS. For example, an SAID's"
also on line 49 get rid of the comma after "received"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **160**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 214   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 7.2.6.3

Change "PDU's MAC" to "MAC PDU"

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **1 6 1**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 215   **Starting Line #** 16   **Section** 7.2.6.4

Merge this line with the previous line into one paragraph.

Reason

Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **162**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 217   **Starting Line #** 60   **Section** 7.3.2
Change "A SS" to "An SS"

Reason
Typo.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **1 6 3**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 217   **Starting Line #** 62   **Section**   7.3.2

Change all occurences throughout the document from "downstream" to "downlink"

Reason

The group decided to use "downlink" instead of "downstream"

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **164**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 218   **Starting Line #** 33   **Section** 7.3.2

Change "a SS" to "an SS"
Make the same change on page 219 line 3.

Reason
Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **165**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 219   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section**   7.3.3

Make section 7.3.3 layout consistent with other PKM sections

Reason

Consistency

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **166**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 219   **Starting Line #** 7   **Section** 7.3.3

Change from "when, within the SS, an event, external" to "when an event, within the SS but external"

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **167**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 219   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 7.3.3

Change "information,but" to "information, but"

Reason
missing space

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **168**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 219   **Starting Line #** 26   **Section** 7.3.3

Several errors in Figure 102. For example, the label from "Start" to "Map Wait" is missing, there should be a "/" after "Map Reply" from "Map Wait" to "Mapped"

Reason

Can take an action item to redraw the figure.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 169   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 219   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 7.3.3

Redo the Table to make it consistant with Tables 69 & 70. Event names on the title column shall be ITALICed as well.

Reason
Readability.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **170**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 220   **Starting Line #** 20   **Section** 7.3.3.1

Make the entire sections 7.3.3.1 (States), 7.3.3.2 (Messages), 7.3.3.3 (Events), and 7.3.3.4 (Parameters) consistant with those of AK and TEK state models, i.e., don't make each item a seperate section.

Reason

Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Duplicate**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **171**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 220   **Starting Line #** 39   **Section** 7.3.3.2.1

Chage "a SA" to "an SA"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a**   Comment Date

Comment # 172   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 220   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 7.3.3.2.3

Change the end of line from "access to" to "to access"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **173**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 220   **Starting Line #** 57   **Section**   7.3.3.3.1

Change "a SS" to "an SS"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **174**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 221   **Starting Line #** 27   **Section** 7.3.3.4.1

Change "SA Wait state" to "Map Wait state"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **175**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 221   **Starting Line #** 63   **Section** 7.3.3.5

Delete the line "-- terminate SA"

Reason

It is not the FSM's (or SS's) job to to terminate SAs.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **176**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section** 7.4.1
Change the title to "BS Key Usage"

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **177**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 9   **Section** 7.4.1

Change "Authorization Key Lifetime" to "AK Lifetime"
Make the same change on lines 31 and line 32.

Reason

Per Table 106 which defines the name of the parameter.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **178**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 29   **Section** 7.4.1

Change the beginning of line to read "second AK (see point (a) and (d) in Figure 103), which shall have a key sequence number one greater than (modulo 16) that of the existing AK and shall be sent back to the requesting SS in an Authorization Reply."

Reason

Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **179**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 37   **Section** 7.4.1

Change "The Authorization Key lifetime" to "The AK's active lifetime"

Reason

Using "Authorization Key lifetime" here can be confused with the system parameter defined in Table 106.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **180**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 37   **Section** 7.4.1

Change "Authorization reply" to "Authorization Reply"

Reason

Message name should be capitalized.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **181**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 38   **Section** 7.4.1

Change "lifetime of AK" to "lifetime of the AK"

Reason

for a specific AK.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **182**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 51   **Section** 7.4.1

Change "HMAC_KEY_U derived from the SS's active AK(s) to" to "HMAC_KEY_U derived from one of the SS's active AKs (see 7.5.4.3) to" and fix the cross-reference.

Reason

can be either one of the two AKs.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Clarified**   **Recommendation by** CE

Should be discussed in the group

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace section 7.4 p 222 l.1 throuh 224 line 64 with the file "comment182.fm"

Replace figure 103 p 225 with file "figure103.ps"
Replace figure 104 p 226 with file "figure104.ps"

Replace section 7.5.3 p 228 with new section provided in "comment 182a.fm"
Replace section 11.4.12 with new section provided in "comment 182a.fm"

replace Page 87 lines 27-31 with " The HMAC Digest attribute shall be the final attribute in the message's attribute list."
replace Page 88 lines 13-17 with " The HMAC Digest attribute shall be the final attribute in the message's attribute list."
replace Page 88 lines 50-54 with " The HMAC Digest attribute shall be the final attribute in the message's attribute list."
replace Page 89 lines 58-62 with " The HMAC Digest attribute shall be the final attribute in the message's attribute list."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Stanley will provide a file "comment182.fm" that replaces section 7.4

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

   Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

   Comment # **1 8 3**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 56   **Section** 7.4.1

Add to the end of the line "(see point (b) in Figure 103)." and fix the cross-reference.

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **184**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 58   **Section** 7.4.1

Change "HMAC_KEY_D derived from an active AK" to "HMAC_KEY_D derived from the active AK selected above (see 7.5.4.3)" and fixed the cross-reference.

Reason

Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 185   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 222   **Starting Line #** 63   **Section** 7.4.1

Delete "to derive the KEK and the HMAC_KEY_D" from the end of the line and the beginning of next line; merge the paragraph on page 223 line 4 with the previous paragraph; and change the end of page 223 line 6 to read "shall be used to derive the KEK and the HMAC_KEY_D."

Reason

Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **186**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 223   **Starting Line #** 46   **Section** 7.4.1

Change "The key lifetime" to "The TEK's active lifetime"

Reason
It is the time period that TEK is active.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **187**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 223   **Starting Line #** 50   **Section** 7.4.2

Change the title of the section to "SS Key Usage"

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **188**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 223   **Starting Line #** 62   **Section** 7.4.2

Change the beginning of the line to read "time, the Authorization Grace Time (see points (x) and (y) in Figure 103), before ..."

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **189**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 224   **Starting Line #** 5   **Section** 7.4.2

Change "tracks the lifetime" to "shall track the lifetimes"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 190   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 224   **Starting Line #** 11   **Section** 7.4.2

Change "SS uses" to "SS shall use"

Reason

required to do.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **191**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 224   **Starting Line #** 18   **Section** 7.4.2

Change the end of the line to read "newer" instead of "new"

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **192**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 224   **Starting Line #** 23   **Section** 7.4.2

Change starting "an SS attempts..." until the end of the paragraph to read "an SS shall request a new set of traffic keying material a configurable amount of time, TEK Grace Time (see points (x) and (y) in Figure 104), before the SS's latest TEK is scheduled to expire.

Reason

clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **193**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 225   **Starting Line #** 20   **Section** 7.4.2

Change "AKx Residual Lifetime" to "AKx Active Lifetime" (3 occurences on this page)

Reason

AK Residual Lifetime was proposed but was rejected everywhere else.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **194**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 226   **Starting Line #** 25   **Section** 7.4.2

Change "TEKx Residual Lifetime" to "TEKx Active Lifetime" (5 occurences on this page)

Reason

TEK Residual Lifetime was proposed but was rejected everywhere else.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **195**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section** 7.5

Change "the protocol" to "the PKM protocol"

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **196**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 4   **Section** 7.5

Change "must support" to "shall support"

Reason

Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **197**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 8   **Section** 7.5.1

Change "Data encryption" to "Data Encryption"

Reason
Capitalization

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **198**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 12   **Section** 7.5.1
Change "US Data" to "US 56-bit Data"

Reason
option 0x01 is specifically for 56-bit DES.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **199**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 15   **Section** 7.5.1

Change the paragraph to read as follows:

The CBC IV shall be calculated as follows: in the downlink, the CBC shall be initialized with the Exclusive-OR (XOR) of (1) the IV parameter included in the TEK keying information, and (2) the content of the PHY Synchronization field of the latest DL-MAP. In the uplink, the CBC shall be initialized with the XOR of (1) the IV parameter included in the TEK keying information, and (2) the content of the PHY Synchronization field of the DL-MAP that is in effect when the UL-MAP for the uplink transmission is created/received.

Reason

With XOR, modulo 2^{64} is not needed, since the IV parameter is always the same length as the block length of cipher, i.e., 64 bits for Suite 0x01. With ripple carry, a 64-bit parallel adder requires 100-200 times longer than XOR (even in HW). While XOR provides different 24 least significant bits, ADD provides different 25 least significant bits. The improvement is minimum.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **200**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 27   **Section** 7.5.1

Change "ECB mode" to "Electronic Code Book (ECB) mode"

Reason

Using ECB for the first time.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **201**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 29   **Section** 7.5.1

Line 29, change "exclusive ored" to "XORed"
Line 31, change "exclusive ORs" to "XORs"
Line 37, change "exclusive ORed" to "XORed"
Line 64, change "EXORing" to "XORing"
Line 65, change "EXOR" to "XOR"
Also add "XOR Exclusive OR" to line 62 page 37.

Reason
clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **202**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 40   **Section** 7.5.1

Change TEKwith" to "TEK with"

Reason

missing space

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **203**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 227   **Starting Line #** 43   **Section** 7.5.1

Change "TEK Exchange Algorithm" to "TEK Encryption Algorithm"
Make the same change on (1) line 15 page 320, and (2) line 41 page 320.

Reason

This TLV specifies the encryption algorithm instead exchange algorithm.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **204**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 228   **Starting Line #** 6   **Section** 7.5.3

Remove the word "and" after the word "HMAC_KEY_D"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **205**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 228   **Starting Line #** 8   **Section** 7.5.3

Change "7.5.4" to "7.5.4.3" and fix the cross-reference.

Reason
Precise reference

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **206**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 228   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 7.5.4

Change the reference from [RFC-1750] to [B64] and fix the cross-reference.

Reason

informative references are referred by [B#]

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

Change the reference from "[RFC-1750]" to "[B64]" and fix the cross-reference.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Reference tag is incorrect. Document is listed in Bibliography with tag B64

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **207**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 228   **Starting Line #** 25   **Section** 7.5.4.1

Add the word "byte" to read "of each byte is a parity bit...."

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

change "of each is" to "of each byte is"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **208**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 228   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 7.5.4.1

Delete the paragraph.

Reason

Should follow the standard.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

This has been discussed before and also been rejected at that time. Requireing parity complicates unnecessarily the system and adds
nothing to it. Intactness of keys is already assured by the HMAC digest.

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **209**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 228   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 7.5.4.2

Change "key material" to "keying material"

Reason

Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do above change and
page 228 on line 32, 37, 49 change "3DES" "3-DES"
other occurrences to change it
p.227 l.41 ,
p 320 l. 48, l.59 & 60

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 210   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 229   **Starting Line #** 6   **Section** 7.5.5

Change the beginning of the line to read "PKM protocol"

Reason
clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **211**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 229   **Starting Line #** 15   **Section** 7.5.6

Change the paragraph to read "The PKM protocol employs the RSA Signature Algorithm [RSA2] with SHA-1 [FIPS-186] for all three of its certificate types, root certificate, manufacturer certificate, and SS certificate."

Reason
clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

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**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review:

Ballot Number: **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **212**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 229   **Starting Line #** 27   **Section** 7.6

Add the following subsection 7.6.1 under section 7.6 and renumber the rest of the subsections.

7.6.1 Certificate Architecture
The PKM protocol includes three types of certificates, root certificate, manufacturer certificate, and SS certificate. The IEEE 802 shall serve as the root CA, which issues certificates to IEEE 802.16 equipment manufacturers. The manufacturer CAs issue certificates to their SSs. Protocols for requesting certificates from a manufacturer CA and distributing the resulting certificates to its SSs shall be internal to the manufacturer.

Reason
clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by** CE
Raise issue in plenary.

Reason for Recommendation
We cannot take this decicsion without asking 802 first.

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**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review:

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **213**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 230   **Starting Line #** 13   **Section** 7.6.1

Delete "and CRLs" from the line.
Make the same change on line 45.

Reason

Should Certificate Revocation List (CRL) be used, clearer instruction MUST be given as how it is used. CRL is described in RFC2459.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Duplicate**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

CRLs are essential for any PKI infrastructure to work properly.

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The handling of CRLs is outside of the scope of this document.

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **214**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 230   **Starting Line #** 21   **Section** 7.6.1.1

Change "must " to "shall"
Make the same change on line 45.

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **215**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 230   **Starting Line #** 38   **Section** 7.6.1.2

Delete the last sentence of the paragraph starting on line 38.

Reason

The SS serial number is being removed.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **216**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 230   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section** 7.6.1.3

Change "OID" to "Object Identifier (OID)"

Reason

Using it for the first time.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **217**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 231   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 8.2.1.1.1

{Note: the comment applies to D2. It is Scott Marin's Comment 1075 from LB#3 and was not previously considered.}

Insert text, "????"

Reason
Define "(204,188) Reed-Solomon" and "GF(256)". While the terms are commonly used, they need precise definition in the 802.16 standards. Isn't 204 the length of the frame in bits and 188 number of payload bits per frame?. Doesn't GF stand for Gal[oire] Field and shouldn't it be in the abreviation list in section 4? If so, insert the appropriate text.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add GF (Galois Field) to the acronym list

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
The comment itself is obsolete as refers to a deleted paragraph

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **218**   **Comment submitted by:**   Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 231   **Starting Line #** 25   **Section** 8.2.1.1.1

{Note: the comment applies to D2. It is Scott Marin's Comment 1076 from LB#3 and was not previously considered.}

At end of the sentence insert text, ",defined in section 8.2.4.4.1.8" or ",defined later."

Reason
Provided reader with a forward reference text that precisely defines the transfer function for a "root-raised cosine" function and the rool-off factor.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
The comment itself is obsolete as refers to a deleted section. Although similar information is mentioned in 8.2.1.1.1 and 8.2.1.1.2 the spirit of the text in these sections is introductury only.

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 219   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 231   **Starting Line #** 33   **Section** 7.6.1.4.1

Change the 3 "TBD" to "IEEE802", "FBWA", and "IEEE802.16 Root CA"

Reason

TBDs

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by** CE

Discuss jointly with TG3-4

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3a   **Comment Date**

Comment # 220   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer   2001-06-14

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 231   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 7.6.1.4.2

Change the "XX" to "SS"
MAke the same change on line 55 and line 58

Reason

TBDs

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by** CE

Change 'XX' to ' WirelessMAN '

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Change 'XX' to ' WirelessMAN '
Make the same change on line 55 and line 58

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **221**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 231   **Starting Line #** 51   **Section** 7.6.1.4.2

Change "Root Certificate Authority" to "CA"

Reason

It is not the root.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change "Root Certificate Authority" to " <Certification Authority> "

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **222**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 231   **Starting Line #** 55   **Section** 7.6.1.4.2

Change "shall be included" to "shall be included."

Reason

Missing "."

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **2 2 3**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 231   **Starting Line #** 57   **Section** 7.6.1.4.2

Add "." to the end of the line and remove the "." from the beginning of next line.

Reason
Typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **2 2 4**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 232   **Starting Line #** 7   **Section** 7.6.1.4.3

Delete line 7 on page 232
Replace lines 10-23 with "The MAC address shall be the SS's MAC address." and merge this line into one paragraph with line 25.
Delete the word "two" from line 31 page 232.

Reason

Remove the optional SS serial number, since SS MAC address can be used to uniquely ID the SS.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 225   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 232   **Starting Line #** 38   **Section** 7.6.1.5

Change RSA public key" to "RSA-Public-Key"

Reason

This is an attribute name and MUST be spelled exactly.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Delete line 38

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **2 2 6**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 2   **Section** 7.6.1.7

Add the following paragraph:

The extensions defined for X.509 V3 certificates provide methods for associating additional attributes with users of public keys and for managing the certification hierarchy. All three types of the PKM certificates are not required to include any extensions, but may include extensions as described in this section and defined in [RFC2459].

Reason

clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Implies additional options. We are only interested in a subset of RFC2459

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Don't add the paragraph suggested but on p.233 line 8 change "shouldshould" to "should".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **227**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 35   **Section** 7.6.2

Change "generation.The" to "generation. The"

Reason

missing space

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **228**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 41   **Section** 7.6.2

Delete the word "modem's"

Reason
unneeded

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by** CE

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **229**   **Comment submitted by:**   Paul   Thompson   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 248   **Starting Line #** 54   **Section**   8.2.1.1

This relates to original Comment 384. I recommend that the text currently in paragraph 8.2.1.1 be included in paragraph 8.2.1 and that paragraphs 8.2.1.1.1 and 8.2.1.1.2 be renumbered as 8.2.1.1.and 8.2.1.2, respectively.

Reason

There is a Section 8.2.1.1 but no Section 8.2.1.2

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **230**   **Comment submitted by:** Jay   Klein

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 250   **Starting Line #** 4   **Section**

Refer to figure 111 and not to 110

Reason

Mistake

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **2 3 1**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 250   **Starting Line #** 5   **Section**   8.2.2.1.1

The Figure 110 doesn't show the case where the downlink carrier is continuous.

Reason

To correct the errored link.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See comment 230

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **232**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 250   **Starting Line #** 5   **Section** 8.2.2.1.1

Change "Figure 110" to "Figure 111"

Reason
Referring to wrong figure

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See comment 230

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **233**   **Comment submitted by:**   Paul   Thompson   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 250   **Starting Line #** 13   **Section** 8.2.2.1.1

This relates to the resolution of original Comment 403. I don't agree that the Comment is superceeded by Comment 573 because I can't find any FDD Frequency Plan in the new document.

Reason

I believe that an Interoperability Standard should have at least one FDD Frequency Plan which is mandatory

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add the following text after line 63 on page 288:

"Although specific channel bandwidths are recommended by this standard it is acknowlegeded that a specific frequency plan is desirable yet due to the wide variations in country specific regulations no single plan can acommodate all cases. For example the 24.5-26.5 GHz band in Europe is regulated by CEPT dictating specific duplex spacing and rasters. This plan does not match a similar available spectrum allocation in North America."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **2 3 4**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 250   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section** **8.2.2.1.2**

In "where a PS is defined as four consecutive modulation symbol times", change "symbol times" to "symbols"

Definitions belong in Clause 3. Can this one be moved there?

Reason
A PS is a chunk of symbols, not a duration of time.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Remove the sentence in line 47 (starting with "The frame..." and ending with "symbol times")
Append a new sentence on pg 248 line 57 to the overview section:

"The downlink and uplink employ fixed duration frames which are divided each into an integer number of physical slots (PS), where the duration of a PS accomodates four consecutive modulation symbols."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **235**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 251   **Starting Line #** 53   **Section** 8.2.2.1.3

Change "aretransmitted" to "are transmitted"

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **236**   **Comment submitted by:** Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 251   **Starting Line #** 60   **Section** 8.2.2.1.3

Change the sentence: "The downlink MAP indicates the number of PSs allocated to ..." to
"The downlink MAP indicates the starting position of a burst.

Reason

The downlink MAP does not indicate length it indicates starting positions.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 237

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 237   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 251   **Starting Line #** 60   **Section** 8.2.2.1.3

Replace the section starting with the sentence "The downlink map..." and ending "..remaining after integral FEC blocks are allocated." with:

The downlink map indicates the number of PSs, i (which must be an integer), allocated to a particular burst and also indicates the burst type (modulation and FEC). Let n denote the minimum number of PSs required for one FEC block of the given burst profile (note that n is not necessarily an integer). Then i=kn+j+q, where k is the number of integral FEC blocks that fit in the burst and j is the number of PSs occupied by the largest possible shortened codeword (not necessarily an integer), and q (always 0 or a fraction) is the number of PSs occupied by pad bits inserted at the end of the burst to guarantee that i is an integer. If the "Fixed Codeword Operation" is being used (see section 8.2.4.4.4.1), then j is always 0. Note that a codeword can end partway through a modulation symbol as well as partway through a PS. When this occurs, the next codeword should start immediately, with no pad bits inserted. At the end of the burst (when there is no "next codeword"), then q*(# bits/symbol)*4 pad bits are added (if required) to complete the PS allocated in the downlink map. Note that pad bits may be required with or without shortening being used.

Also, redraw figures 113 and 114 to show explicitly that the codewords do not necessarily occupy and integer number of modulation symbols or PSs, and also show explicitly a field of length "q" containing pad bits at the end of the burst to result in an integer number of PSs.

Reason
The current specification is unclear what should be done in the case that a codeword ends within a physical slot, or a modulation symbol.

The discussion on page 251, lines 61-65 defines a variable 'n' which denotes the "minimum number of PSs required for one FEC block of the given burst profile." Although it does not explicitly say so, the discussion and figures 113 and 114 imply that 'n' is an integer. This is not nessesarily true, in fact a codeword is may not even end on a symbol boundary. For example, suppose a Reed-Solomon +inner parity code with K=21, R=14 is used with 16 QAM modulation. Each codeword occupies 78.75 modulation symbols (i.e. 78 symbols + 3 bits of the 79th symbol) and 19.6875 physical slots. Similar cases can occur with 64 QAM when using the Reed-Solomon code.

Several possibilities exist:
(1) Immediately start the next codeword within the same modulation symbol
(2) Restrict the allowed codewords to those that occupy an integer number of symbols (or even PSs)
(3) Pad the remaining bits in the modulation symbol, then start the next codeword on the following symbol.

The proposal above assumes #1 is chosen.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change the text to:

The number of PSs, i (which must be an integer), allocated to a particular burst can be calculated from the downlink MAP (which indicates starting positions of bursts) where and also indicates the burst type (modulation and FEC). Let n denote the minimum number of PSs required for one FEC block of the given burst profile (note that n is not necessarily an integer). Then i=kn+j+q, where k is the number of integral FEC blocks that fit in the burst and j is the number of PSs occupied by the largest possible shortened codeword (not necessarily an integer), and q (always 0 or a fraction) is the number of PSs occupied by pad bits inserted at the end of the burst to guarantee that i is an integer. If the "Fixed Codeword Operation" is being used (see section 8.2.4.4.4.1), then j is always 0. Note that a codeword can end partway through a modulation symbol as well as partway through a PS. When this occurs, the next codeword should start immediately, with no pad bits inserted. At the end of the burst (when there is no "next codeword"), then q*(# bits/symbol)*4 pad bits are added (if required) to complete the PS allocated in the downlink map. Note that pad bits may be required with or without shortening being used.

figures to be modified by Jay.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **238**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 252   **Starting Line #** 58   **Section** 8.2.2.2

On page 252, line 58 change "station registration" to "initial access"
On page 253, line 7 change "Registration" to "Initial Maintenance"

Reason

This is not where "registration" happens. This is where initial system access happens. The official name (from the UIUC definitions) of these slots is Initial Station Maintenance intervals.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Editor please note that 2nd comment relates to figure 115

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3 a   **Comment Date**

Comment # 239   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 252   **Starting Line #** 64   **Section** 8.2.2.2

Add a sentence "Note that any of these burst classes may or may not be present in any given frame, and may occur in any order and any quantity (limited by number of available PS) within the frame at the discretion of the BS uplink scheduler."

Reason

Clarity. The pircture shows 1 case out of an enormous number of possibilities.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Use Ken's text with a slight modification:

"Note that any of these burst classes may or may not be present in any given frame, and may occur in any order and any quantity (limited by number of available PSs) within the frame at the discretion of the BS uplink scheduler."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **240**   **Comment submitted by:** Jay   Klein

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 253   **Starting Line #** 41   **Section**

delete the "will" s in "...will both will"

Reason
grammar

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **241**   **Comment submitted by:** Jay   Klein

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 253   **Starting Line #** 50   **Section**

There is a missing reference and should be "in 8.2.2.1.3 or 8.2.4.4.4.4."

Reason
Clarity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 242   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 254   **Starting Line #** 8   **Section** 8.2.3.1

On page 254 line 8; page 254 line 29; page 254 line 51; page 255 line 31; and page 255, line 56 change "1 to 40" to "16 to 40".

Reason

This section is not discussing all possible PHYs for 802.16, just the 10-66 GHz PHY.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **243**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 254   **Starting Line #** 31   **Section** 8.2.3.2

Change "0-12" to "1-13"

Reason

To match the DIUC table.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **244**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 254   **Starting Line #** 39   **Section** 8.2.3.2

Delete lines 39-40.
Delete lines 61-62.

Reason
This particular PHY no longer has a frameless option.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment # 245   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 254   **Starting Line #** 60   **Section** 8.2.3.3

Fix the Remark. It reads "if both start and end of active region in frame are zero this should be interpreted as frameless operation. A start active region greater than zero indicates half-duplex (i.e., TDD or FDD) operation."

Reason

Confusing.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Superceded**

See 244. Remark has been deleted for this particular PHY

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 2 4 6   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 255   **Starting Line #** 8   **Section** 8.2.3.4

On page 255, line 8 change "quarter" to "eighth"
On page 311, line 11 change "1/4" to "1/8"

Reason

Better resolution will better enable QAM-64 operation on the uplink, and the field in the RNG-RES message is already sized large enough to accomodate 1/8 symbol resolution.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

The evidence needed for proving the point that better resolution will better enable 64QAM on the uplink is missing.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 247   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 257   **Starting Line #** 2   **Section** 8.2.4.2.1

Delete the phrase "when the downlink physical layer is implemented"

Reason

If we don't implement the PHY, the rest is moot. I think this is a typo resulting for removal of PHY mode A.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **248**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 257   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 8.2.4.2.1

Add "in the remainder of the downlink subframe" to the end of the sentence.

Reason
To make it clear where the SS is looking for MAC headers.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **249**   **Comment submitted by:** Jay   Klein

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 258   **Starting Line #** 46   **Section**

Replace "all SS" with "all SSs"

Reason

Grammar

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **250**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 260   **Starting Line #** 24   **Section** 8.2.4.2.4
Change "1(DIUC=0)" to "1 (DIUC=0)"

Reason
missing space

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3 a

Comment Date

Comment # 251   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 260   **Starting Line #** 27   **Section** 8.2.4.2.4

The standard must report the PHY characteristics (modulation, FEC) of the Gap Downlink Burst Type (DIUC=14).

Reason

The standard says that the Gap Downlink Burst Type (DIUC=14) shall not be defined in the DCD message because it is well-known, but there are not anywhere in the standard the characteristics (Modulation, FEC) of this DIUC.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Gap=Silence meaning no additional parameters needed

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 252   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 260   **Starting Line #** 30   **Section** 8.2.4.2.4

Add the Paragraph

"The End of DL-MAP Burst Type (DIUC=15) indicates the first PS after the end of the DL subframe. It is well known andshall not be included in the DCD message."

Reason

Completeness in defining the predefined DIUCs.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Slightly modify (missing space...):

"The End of DL-MAP Burst Type (DIUC=15) indicates the first PS after the end of the DL subframe. It is well known and shall not be included in the DCD message."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 253   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 261   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 8.2.4.2.5

Delete "For PHY Type = {0,1},"

Reason

These are all the PHY types.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Change "For PHY Type = {0, 1}, a number of information elements as defined as in Table 76 ..."
to
"The information elements as defined in Table 76 ..."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **254**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 261   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 8.2.4.2.5

Change "Base Station ID field" to "Number of DL-MAP Elements filed of the DL-MAP message"

Reason

Correctness and clarity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **2 5 5**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 263   **Starting Line #** 51   **Section** 8.2.4.4.1

The DIUC numbers for Gap, End of Map and Extended DIUC in Table 79 must agree with those in Table 74.

Reason

There are different DIUC numbers in the two Tables.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 256

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **256**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 263   **Starting Line #** 51   **Section**   8.2.4.4.1

On page 263, line 51 add a row containing "13 l reserved"
On page 263, line 52 change "13" to "14"
On page 263, line 53 change "14" to "15"
On page 263, delete the row at line 56

Reason
Consistence with Table 74

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 257   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 263   **Starting Line #** 61   **Section** 8.2.4.4.2
Change "exits" to "exist"

Reason
grammar

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change the following:
"Since there exists some optional modulation and FEC schemes that can be implemented at the subscriber
station, there must exist some method for identifying the capability to the base station (i.e., including the
highest order modulation supported, the optional FEC coding schemes supported, interleaving type supported, and the minimum shortened
last codeword length supported). This information shall be communicated to the base station during the subscriber registration period."

to

"Since there are optional modulation and FEC schemes that can be implemented at the subscriber
station, a method for identifying the capability to the base station is required (i.e., including the
highest order modulation supported, the optional FEC coding schemes supported, interleaving type supported, and the minimum shortened
last codeword length supported). This information shall be communicated to the base station during the subscriber registration period."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **258**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 263   **Starting Line #** 64   **Section** 8.2.4.4.2

Delete "interleaving type supported"

Reason

This PHY does not support interleaving

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **259**   **Comment submitted by:** Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 264   **Starting Line #** 15   **Section** 8.2.4.4.3

In order to clarify input data ordering, and initialisation update figure 120. Also delete the enable function which is not relevant in the figure and update the text in the figure. New figure is submitted in 802.16.1c-01/31.

Reason
Clearification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **2 6 0**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 265   **Starting Line #** 7   **Section** 8.2.4.4.4

Change "The coding rate is 2/3." to "The coding rate of the inner BCC is 2/3."

Reason

Clarity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**

                                                                                                                        Comment Date

Comment # **261**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 265   **Starting Line #** **11**   **Section** 8.2.4.4.4

The standard must have an example or reference for using the parity code for error correction employing a soft decoder.

Reason

To remove ambiguity.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

It is important to define clearly the encoder structure. The decoder can be proprietary and differ between vendors.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 262   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 265   **Starting Line #** 44   **Section** 8.2.4.4.4.1

Should page 265 line 44, page 266 line 21, page 285 line 1 and page 285 line 20 be header level 7?

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

This seems to be an IEEE pure editorial issue - number of levels allowed in a standard document.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **2 6 3**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 265   **Starting Line #** 46   **Section** 8.2.4.4.4.1

Change "in the same" to "is the same"

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 264   **Comment submitted by:** Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 266   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 8.2.4.4.4.1

Insert the word randomized in the sentence in order to clarify this fact. The sentence will then read: "When a number of randomized MAC messages .. "

On Line 6 delete A2

On line 7 Change A3 to: "RS encode the K bytes and append the R parity bytes

On Line 8 Change A4 to: "Serialize the bytes and transmit them to the inner coder or the modulator MSB first.

Make the same corrections for the Shortened Lats Codeword Operation on page 267

Reason

Randomization is defined in a previous section. It can be very confusing to mention randomization here because the reader can get impression that it should be performed twice.

It also extremely important in every serialization operation to indicate which bit is to be transmitted first.

The encoding procedure for the fixed codeword operation can produce long sequences of unrandomized constant data which effectively will transmit a sinewave. When this is long it might be a problem for the equalizator.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Insert the word randomized in the sentence in order to clarify this fact. The sentence will then read: "When a number of randomized MAC messages .. "

On Line 6 delete A2 and renumber accordingly

On line 7 Change A3 to: "RS encode the K bytes and append the R parity bytes

On Line 8 Change A4 to: "Serialize the bytes and transmit them to the inner coder or the modulator MSB first.

Make the same corrections for the Shortened Last Codeword Operation on page 267

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 265   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 266   **Starting Line #** 41   **Section**   8.2.4.4.4.1

On page 266 line 41 and line 47, and on page 273, line 1, the "hex" in "FFhex" should be subscripted

Reason

consistency with rest of PHY section

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3 a   **Comment Date**

Comment # 266   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 267   **Starting Line #** 13   **Section** 8.2.4.4.4.1

Eliminate lines 13-22.

Reason

Line 13 states.."When the number of bytes (M) entering the FEC process is greater than or equal to K bytes,..", but the preface to this (p266, lines 52-56) describe how to deal with the full codewords, so, M will never be greater or equal to K. It appears that these lines were cut-and-pasted from p266, lines 14-19, but they do not make sense in the context of the description at the bottom of p266. Another possible resolution is to change the paragraph at the bottom of page 266.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

(1) Delete line 1 on page 267
(2) Delete steps A1 and A2 (lines 4,5 page 267) and renumber following steps accordingly
(3) Change language in A4 according to comment 264
(4) Delete lines 12 to 22 page 267

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **267**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 267   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section** 8.2.4.4.4.2

Add a sentence:

A system is only required to implement the decoder for the type 2 inner code for QPSK modulation.

Reason
A trellis decoder to decode this code for 16 QAM and 64 QAM is quite complex. However, since the inner code is fairly low-rate, it is not likely to be useful for a higher order modulation format. This code is primarily to provide a very robust link using QPSK. Since the current specification requires 16 QAM on the downlink, and no exception is mentioned, it implies that a system must implement a decoder for the convolutional code using 16 QAM. Similarly, if a manufacturer chooses to implement 64 QAM, the spec could be interpreted to mean that the trellis decoder must be implemented for 64 QAM.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

The group would like to restrict the use of the type 2 code with QPSK only. This means that the code cannot be used in combination with 16QAM or 64QAM. Furthermore for clarity it is emphasized that QPSK is not required to use this code in all cases except in the case of the control channel (DIUC=0) where it is mandated that QPSK shall use a type 2 code.

Editor is required to come up with correct "standard wording" (i.e., "shall").

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 268   **Comment submitted by:**   Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 267   **Starting Line #** 45   **Section** 8.2.4.4.4.2

Insert a figure explaining the BCC. The figure is submitted in 802161c-01_31.

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Add a figure (using Lars's input) after table 81 (page 267). Insert the following text (before the figure):

"In figure XXX, the exact encoding parity equations are described."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **269**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 272   **Starting Line #** 45   **Section** 8.2.4.4.5

Add a row containing "BCC Code Type | 1 | (24,16)"

Reason

For completeness and consistency with section 8.2.4.2.3.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 270   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 272   **Starting Line #** 48   **Section** 8.2.4.4.5

On lines 48 and 50, change "Manufacturer specific" to "Deployment scenario specific"

Reason

These thresholds cannot be manufacturer specific since there is 1 value that must be used for all SSs on a channel.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 271   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 272   **Starting Line #** 59   **Section** 8.2.4.4.6

Change "initializatioin" to "initialization"

Reason

spelling

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **272**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 272   **Starting Line #** 62   **Section** 8.2.4.4.6

Change "could be" to "shall be"

Reason

It must be a single burst.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:　　　　　　　　**Ballot Number:** **3 a**　　　　　　　　　　　**Comment Date**

Comment # **273**　　　　**Comment submitted by:**　Ken　　　　　　Stanwood

Change　　　　**Type** Technical, Non-binding　　　**Starting Page #** 273　　**Starting Line #** 13　　　**Section** 8.2.4.4.7

Eliminate sentence starting with "The CAZAC sequence is rotated..."

Reason

Tables 88 and 89 already define the required I and Q values. The sentence in question seems to confuse the issue by implying that the preamble sequence should be rotated 45 degrees from the I and Q values defined in tables 88 and 89. Another way of clarifying would be to state "The CAZAC sequence is rotated +45 degrees (as shown in tables 88 and 89)..."

Proposed Resolution　　**Recommendation:**　　　　　　　**Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group　　　　**Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change the text in lines 7-16 to the following:

Table 87 through Table 89 define the preambles for the different downlink burst types. These preambles are based upon CAZAC (constant amplitude zero auto-correlation) sequences [B52]. The original sequences are rotated +45 degrees and transmitted so that the constellation points of the preamble coincide with the outmost constellation points of the modulation scheme in use. The frame start preamble is always at the first part of a downlink frame and consists of a 32 symbol preamble (Burst Preamble 1), which is generated by repeating twice a CAZAC sequence of length 16 symbols. In the case of the TDMA mode on a downlink, user bursts are transmitted with a shortened preamble of 16 symbols (Burst Preamble 2), which is generated with a single length 16 CAZAC sequence.

Change the text on page 286 line 48-52 to:

The preamble is based upon an integer number of repetitions of the following length 16 CAZAC sequence (constant amplitude zero auto-correlation) sequence [B52]. The original sequence is rotated +45 degrees and transmitted so that the constellation points of the preamble coincide with the outmost constellation points of the modulation scheme in use. Table 98 defines the bit sequence for the base preamble. The number of repititions is defined by the base station.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **274**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 280   **Starting Line #** 54   **Section** 8.2.4.4.10

Add a subsection:

8.2.4.4.10 Spectral Inversion.
The transmitted downlink signal must compensate for any spectral inversion in the transmit radio, such that there is no inversion at the antenna port.

Reason

The spectrum of the signal may be inverted depending on the details of the up conversion within the radio. This comment proposes that the downlink signal compensate for the inversion if the radio design causes it. This can be done simply by interchanging the "I" and "Q" signals in the baseband processing. Without this requirement, the SS would need to determine the spectral inversion of the received signal during the registration process.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 275

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:　　　　　　　　　　**Ballot Number: 3 a**　　　　　　　　　　　　**Comment Date**

Comment # 275　　　　**Comment submitted by:** Lars　　　　　Lindh

Change　　　**Type** Technical, Non-binding　　**Starting Page #** 280　　**Starting Line #** 60　　**Section** 8.2.4.4.9

Insert a section defining the modulated signal as

$$S(t) = I(t)\cos(2\pi f_c t) - Q(t)\sin(2\pi f_c t)$$

where I(t) and Q(t) are the filtered baseband signals and fc is the carrier frequency.

Reason

Proposed Resolution　　　**Recommendation:**　　　　　　　　**Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group　　　　　**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Add a subsection:

8.2.4.4.10 Spectral Inversion.
The transmitted downlink signal must compensate for any spectral inversion in the transmit radio, such that there is no inversion at the antenna port as defined by the following equation:

$$S(t) = I(t)\cos(2\pi f_c t) - Q(t)\sin(2\pi f_c t)$$

where I(t) and Q(t) are the filtered baseband signals, S(t) is the transmitted signal at the antenna port and fc is the carrier frequency.

Editor please note that "pi" actualy means the mathematical constant 3.14... and fc should be subscripted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **276**   **Comment submitted by:**   Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 281   **Starting Line #** 10   **Section** 8.2.4.4.10

In the case of BCC inner code the information byte length must be even

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Insert on pg. 265 line 8 (after "The coding rate is 2/3."):

Note: The number of information bytes must be even in this case.

Insert on pg. 267 line 45:

The number of information bytes must be even as the BCC code operates on byte pairs.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **277**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 282   **Starting Line #** 50   **Section** 8.2.5.3

delete the sentence that begins "Consequently the first..."

Reason

This is not at all necessary.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

Remove the short sentence only ending with "...of 0."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:		Ballot Number: **3 a**		Comment Date

Comment # 278   **Comment submitted by:** Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 283   **Starting Line #** 36   **Section** 8.2.5.3

Based on Table 96, which describes the Uplink Map Information Elements, there is the Request IE, which can have as Connection ID either the Basic CID of the SS or the specific traffic CID of the SS (polling is done on either an SS or connection basis). But for each entry (UIUC) of the Table 96 there is a specific burst descriptor, which describes the physical characteristics (modulation, FEC) of this UIUC. This means that all the SSs must send the Bandwidth Request header with a specific modulation/FEC that is described from the corresponding burst descriptor of the UIUC=1 (Request IE). But the last conflicts with the section 6.2.6.4.1, figure 37 that says that the SS sends the unicast Bandwidth Request header using the operational burst profile.

The standard must explicitly notes the following:

When the BS executes unicast polling then the polled SS sends a Bandwidth Request header along with data, using the operational burst profile of the SS and not the burst descriptor of the Request IE (UIUC=1).

When the BS executes broadcast or multicast polling then the SSs send the Bandwidth Request headers in the BW Request contention slots region using the burst descriptor of the UIUC=1 (Request IE).

Reason

To remove ambiguity.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 117, line 44 add the following paragraph:

"A GPC SS may use Request IEs that are broadcast, directed at a multicast polling group it is a member of, or directed at a unicast connection ID that represents a service flow belonging to that SS. In all cases, the Request IE burst profile is used, even if the BS is capable of receiving the SS with a more efficient burst profile. To take advantage of a more efficient burst profile, the SS should transmit in a Data Grant IE directed at a unicast connection ID that represents a service flow belonging to that SS. Because of this, unicast polling of a GPC SS would normally be done by allocating a Data Grant IE directed at a unicast connection ID that represents a service flow belonging to that SS. Also note that in a a Data Grant IE directed at a unicast connection ID that represents a service flow belonging to a GPC SS, the SS shall only make bandwidth requests for the indicated connection."

On page 118, line 62 add the following paragraph:

"A GPSS SS may use Request IEs that are broadcast, directed at a multicast polling group it is a member of, or directed at its Basic

connection ID. In all cases, the Request IE burst profile is used, even if the BS is capable of receiving the SS with a more efficient burst profile. To take advantage of a more efficient burst profile, the SS should transmit in a Data Grant IE directed at its Basic CID. Because of this, unicast polling of a GPSS SS would normally be done by allocating a Data Grant IE directed at its Basic CID. Also note that in a Data Grant IE directed at its Basic CID, the SS may make bandwidth requests for any of its connections."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **279**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 283   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 8.2.5.3

On lines 49, 52, 55, and 57 add a space before "assignment"

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **280**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 283   **Starting Line #** 65   **Section**   8.2.5.3

Change "any" to "NA"

Reason
Consistency with the first row of the table.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 281   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 284   **Starting Line #** 2   **Section** 8.2.5.4

Insert the following text : "For Bandwidth Requests transmitted in the Bandwidth Request Contention Slots the Uplink Transmission Convergence (TC) Sublayer doesn't need to have the TC pointer byte because the Bandwidth Request header is only 6 bytes which is the minimum information block length for the Reed Solomon. So it fits exactly to one Reed Solomon codeword."

Reason

To save uplink bandwidth .

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

The bandwidth savings is small (1 or 2 bytes per frame = 1-2/5000 PSs) compared to some (minor) complexity handling this special case.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **282**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 286   **Starting Line #** 50   **Section** 8.2.5.5.3

Eliminate the sentence starting with .. "The CAZAC sequence is rotated..."

Reason

Table 98 already defines the required I and Q values. The sentence in question seems to confuse the issue by implying that the preamble sequence should be rotated 45 degrees from the I and Q values defined in table 98. Another way of clarifying would be to state "The CAZAC sequence is rotated +45 degrees (as shown in table 98)..."

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 273

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **283**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 286   **Starting Line #** 52   **Section** 8.2.5.5.3

Change "modulation" to "the modulation"

Reason

grammar

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **284**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 287   **Starting Line #** 56   **Section** 8.2.5.5.6

Add a subsection:

8.2.5.5.6 Spectral Inversion.
The transmitted uplink signal must compensate for any spectral inversion in the transmit radio, such that there is no inversion at the antenna port.

Reason

The spectrum of the signal may be inverted depending on the details of the up conversion within the radio. This comment proposes that the uplink signal compensate for the inversion if the radio design causes it. This can be done simply by interchanging the "I" and "Q" signals in the baseband processing. Without this requirement, the BS (which could be listening to SSs from several different vendors) would need to determine the spectral inversion on a burst-by-burst basis.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

dd a subsection:

8.2.5.5.6 Spectral Inversion.
The transmitted uplink signal must compensate for any spectral inversion in the transmit radio, such that there is no inversion at the antenna port as defined by the following equation:

$$S(t) = I(t)\cos(2\pi f_c t) - Q(t)\sin(2\pi f_c t)$$

where I(t) and Q(t) are the filtered baseband signals, S(t) is the transmitted signal at the antenna port and fc is the carrier frequency.

Editor please note that "pi" actualy means the mathematical constant 3.14... and fc should be subscripted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 285   **Comment submitted by:** Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 288   **Starting Line #** 10   **Section** 8.2.5.5.6

In the case of BCC inner code the information byte length must be even

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Superceded**

See 276

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**

                                                                                    Comment Date

Comment # **286**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 288   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 8.2.5.5.6

If the final decision is the Transmission Convergence sublayer to be selectable on/off for the SS transmit, then you must somewhere define this parameter. A proper place is the 11.1.1.2 UCD Burst Profile Encodings table, so you must add a new entry :
Transmission Convergence sublayer / 0=enabled, 1=disabled

Reason

The Transmission Convergence sublayer can be enabled/disabled but there is not defined in the standard the parameter that controls that.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

(1) Delete table entry on page 288 line 28, "Transmission Convergence Sub layer"
(2) On page 262, line 32, replace "is segmented" with "shall be segmented"
(3) On page 262, line 34, replace "pointer byte is added" with "pointer byte shall be added"
(4) Delete contents of section 8.2.5.4 and replace with "The uplink transmission convergence sub-layer operation shall be identical to the downlink transmission convergence sub-layer operation as described in section 8.2.4.3 ."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **287**   **Comment submitted by:** Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 288   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 8.2.5.5.6

Based on Table 99 the Transmission convergence sublayer can be selectable on/off.
I believe that the Transmission convergence sublayer must not be an optional Uplink Physical Layer parameter for the following reasons:
    * It helps the receiving BS MAC layer to identify the beginning of each MAC PDU
    * In any case the SS transmitter needs to have a mechanism to segment the uplink payload into blocks of data designed to fit into the proper codeword size

If the final decision is the Transmission convergence sublayer to be selectable on/off, then the Tranmsission convergence capability must be a parameter of the SS Capabilities Encoding. Specifically in this case insert a new section "11.4.5.2.5 10-66 GHz PHY SS Uplink Transmission convergence sublayer" that will define for each SS if it supports or not the Transmission convergence sublayer.

Reason
To remove ambiguity.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 286

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **2 8 8**   **Comment submitted by:**   Allan   Klein

Change   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 288   **Starting Line #** 57   **Section** 8.2.6

Add additional channelization options to address 10.5 GHz applications.   7 MHz and 3.5 MHz should be included as they are frequently used by products already operating in this frequency band.

Reason

Channel sizes of 20 MHz and greater are not viable for typical frequency allocations at 10.5 GHz, where the overall 150 MHz band is sub-divided for use among many different operators- typically in tranches of 30 MHz. Since the standard is supposed to address applications from 10-66 GHz, at least one of the mandatory channelizations should be suitable for 10. 5 GHz applications. The specific channelizations and baud rates were submitted as comments to letter ballot # 3.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

The fact that the 802.16 (TG1) standard addresses 10-66 GHz does not mean that ANY spectrum oppurtunity could be used for LMDS-like services (i.e., 20 MHz vs. 500 MHz). The example given by the comment is more suitable for the 802.16a (TG3) case which addresses such spectrum oppurtunities in a better way. The fact that 10 GHz is a lower limit to 802.16 (TG1) is more of propagation aspects and suitability of the PHY.

Furthermore, please note the actual language of section 8.2.6 :
"...other combinations of channel size, symbol rate, roll-off factor, and frame duration could be made, but interoperability will not be guaranteed in these cases."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3a**   Comment Date

Comment # 289   **Comment submitted by:** Paul   Thompson   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 289   **Starting Line #** 32   **Section** 8.2.7.3

Reference original Comment 412. Change the word "should" to "shall" on this Line and also on Lines 33 and 37.

Reason

An Interoperability Standard must be explicit about a minimum set of requirements. If, as it was said in the resolution of Comment 412, Power Control is a "core part of the PHY," then the use of "shall" seems appropriate.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

(1) On line 33 replace "should" with "shall"
(2) On line 37 replace the sentence "The power control algorithm..." with the following:
"A power control algorithm shall be designed to support power
attenuation due to distance loss or power fluctuations at rates of at most 10 dB/second with depths of at least
40 dB. The exact algorithm implementation is vendor specific."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **290**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 289   **Starting Line #** 48   **Section** 8.2.8

Change " in the vicinity of 24 to 31 GHz" to "in the frequency range of 24 to 31 GHz"

Reason

The word "vicinity" is ambiguous. If the intent is to provide some margin in the frequency range, it should be stated explicitly, for example "20 to 35 GHz".

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change " in the vicinity of 24 to 31 GHz" to "in the frequency range of 24 to 32 GHz"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Agree with Ken's observation yet extend the upper limit to 32 GHz covering a potential ETSI related band.

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **291**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 290   **Starting Line #** 8   **Section** 8.2.8

Add the following text to the "Tx Symbol Timing Accuracy" section:

The Tx symbol timing accuracy shall be within +/- 15 ppm of its
nominal value (including aging and temperature variations).

Reason

Provides a bound on the symbol timing error that the SS receiver has to deal with
since the symbol clock on the SS has to be locked to the BS symbol clock.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 292   **Comment submitted by:** Jay   Klein

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 290   **Starting Line #** 24   **Section**

In Table-101 and Table-102 (line 61...), the column entry corresponding to Modulation accuracy must be changed to numbers reflecting similar operating BER. For example:

20% (QPSK) , 6.7% (QAM-16), 2.9% (QAM-64) - Ideal Receiver without Equalizer
10% (QPSK), 3.3% (QAM-16), 1.5% (QAM-64) - Ideal Receiver with Equalizer

Reason

The current EVM numbers in the spec are inconsistent (i.e they do not lead to the same raw BER for different constellations). Also, they do not distinguish between equalizable and non-equalizable impairments (see other comment from the submitter)

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Accept the recommend change with the following numbers and remarks:

12% (QPSK) , 6% (16QAM), 2% (64QAM) (Note: Measured with an Ideal Receiver without Equalizer, all transmitter impairments included)
10% (QPSK), 3% (16QAM), 1.5% (64QAM) (Note: Measured with an Ideal Receiver with an Equalizer, linear distortion removed)
Note: Tracking loop bandwidth is assumed to be between 1% to 5% optimized per phase noise characteristics. The tracking loop bandwidth is defined in the following way. A lowpass filter with unity gain at DC and frequency response H(f), has a tracking loop (noise) bandwidth (BL), defined as the integral of l H(f)l squared from 0 to the sampling frequency. The output power of white noise passed through an ideal brick wall filter of bandwidth BL will be identical to that of white noise passed through any lowpass filter with the same tracking loop (noise) bandwidth.

Editor note: The "L" in BL should be subscripted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **293**   **Comment submitted by:**   Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 290   **Starting Line #** 24   **Section** 8.2.8

Change EVM values to

12% QPSK
6% 16-QAM
2% 64-QAM

assuming a receiver tracking loop bandwidth of 5% of the symbol rate

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 292

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **294**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 290   **Starting Line #** 33   **Section** 8.2.8

Clarify ambiguity in "at least –28 dBW/MBaud". The phrase suggests that dB should scale linearly with symbol rate, but you really mean that the absolute power does.

Reason

Ambiguity.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace "at least –28 dBW/MBaud (i.e., –15 dBW = 15 dBm for 20 MBaud)
(measured at antenna port)" with "at least -15 dBm (measured at antenna port)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **295**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 290   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 8.2.8

In Table 102 the standard says about the Tx burst timing accuracy that "Must implement corrections to burst timing with an accuracy of +/- 0.25 of a symbol and a resolution of +/- 0.125 of a symbol."
But the RNG-RSP message from BS has a Tx timing offset adjustment which is a signed 32-bit, units of ? symbols. What is the purpose of the above resolution of +/- 0.125 of a symbol?

Reason
To remove ambiguity.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace "Must implement corrections to burst timing with an accuracy of +/- 0.25 of a symbol and a resolution of +/- 0.125 of a symbol."
with
"Must implement corrections to burst timing in steps of +/- 0.25 of a symbol with step accuracy of +/- 0.125 of a symbol"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 296   **Comment submitted by:** Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 290   **Starting Line #** 61   **Section** 8.2.8

Change EVM values to

12% QPSK
6% 16-QAM
2% 64-QAM

assuming a receiver tracking loop bandwidth of 5% of the symbol rate

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Superceded**

See 292

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # 297   Comment submitted by: Ken   Stanwood

Change   Type Technical, Non-binding   Starting Page # 291   Starting Line # 15   Section 8.2.8

Change "64-QAM: -76 + 10log 10 (B)" to "64-QAM: -74 + 10log 10 (B)"

Reason

For QPSK and 16-QAM the threshold difference between 1E-3 and 1E-6 is 4 dB, for 64-QAM it is shown as 3 dB. Since 64-QAM is more sensitive to impairment, it needs an extra 1 dB between 1E-3 and 1E-6 compared to QPSK and 16-QAM. Starting with 1E-3 @ -79, adding (4+1) gives -74 as shown above.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **298**   **Comment submitted by:** Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 291   **Starting Line #** 22   **Section** 8.2.8

Change Maximum Transition time from Tx to Rx and Rx to Tx to 20us.

Reason

2 us is difficult to achieve for half-duplex terminals. It is not a critical value for terminals can always be scheduled to not receive data immediately before transmitting.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change numbers to "2 uSec (TDD), 20 uSec (FDD, Half-duplex terminal)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **299**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 291   **Starting Line #** 25   **Section** 8.2.8

Add the following note:

The interfering source shall be a continuous like modulated signal. The spectral mask of the interfering signal will depend on local regulatory requirements. For example, where ETSI regulations apply, the 1st and 2nd adjacent interference test shall be performed with the interfering signal conforming to the ETSI Type C spectral mask. In cases where alternative masks are permitted, the interfering signal shall conform to the ETSI Type B spectral mask.

Reason

To clarify the nature of the interfering signal and its spectral occupancy.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add the following note to the end of table 103 (with reference to 1st adj. channel interference and 2nd adj. channle interference items in the table):

Note: The interfering source shall be a continuous, same modulation as the interfered signal. The spectral mask of the interfering signal will depend on local regulatory requirements. For example, where ETSI regulations apply, the 1st and 2nd adjacent interference test shall be performed with the interfering signal conforming to the ETSI Type C spectral mask. In cases where alternative masks are permitted, the interfering signal shall conform to the ETSI Type B spectral mask.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **300**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 292   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section** 8.2.8.1.1

Change "defined No" to defined. No"

Reason

missing period

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **301**   **Comment submitted by:**   Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 292   **Starting Line #** 12   **Section** 8.28.1.1

Define "Tap Number, "Tap Delay, and "Tap Amplitude" by providing a reference to a model which makes use of these parameters or a set of equations that illustrated their meaning.

Reason

These terms are useless unless they are defined.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Add the following after table 104:

The channel model can be expressed as:

$$H(jw) = C1*exp(-j*wT1)+C2*exp(-j*wT2)+C3*exp(-j*wT3)+...$$

where C1,C2,C3... are tap amplitudes (complex) and T1,T2,T3... are tap delays

Furthermore, add to the end of line 6:

For example, if B=20 MBaud the resulting tap delays in table 104 will be 0, 20 and 40 nSec.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 302   **Comment submitted by:** Paul   Thompson   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 293   **Starting Line #** 32   **Section** 8.2.8.2.2

This Comment relates to original Comment 426. I agree with the resolution of this comment, but the specific text described in the resolution (about the 802.16.2 mask) did not get into the document.

Reason

Section 1.2 states: "This Standard is intended to enable...deployment of..interoperable multivendor broadband wireless access products." This is really the whole justification for the existence of the TG1 Standards effort. I believe that the Standard should take a position on the minimum mask that is acceptable for interoperability purposes and I believe that an appropriate mask is the one receommended by Coexistence considerations.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

In Session #13 it was identified that the reference to the TG2 draft is wrong as it is not applicable as a channel mask.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **3 0 3**   **Comment submitted by:**   Jay   Klein

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 293   **Starting Line #** 62   **Section**

After line 62, add the following lines:

To quantify Tx performance, EVM is measured under the following conditions:
1). Ideal Receiver, without equalizer, with a PLL of noise bandwidth 1% of the baud rate.
2). Ideal Receiver, with equalizer, with a PLL of noise bandwidth 1 % of the baud rate

Add a definition of Noise Bandwidth.
A lowpass filter with unity gain at DC and frequency response H(f), has a noise bandwidth (BL), defined as the integral of I H(f)I squared
from 0 to the sampling frequency. The output power of white noise passed through an ideal brick wall filter of bandwidth BL will be identical
to that of white noise passed through any lowpass filter with the same noise bandwidth.

Furthermore, the measurement period should not include a preamble.

Reason
Reason:

In order to guarantee interoperability, the Transmitter impairments need to be specified in an non ambiguous way.
The changes above measure:

1. Tx impairments due to filtering errors - which can be removed by equalization
2. Tx impairments due to self noise

 The PLL is specified to ensure that phase noise does not distort the EVM measurements.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 292

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The group felt that the preamble portion in the transmission is a small part of a 1/4 of a frame and won't influence the EVM measurment.

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: **Ballot Number: 3a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 304   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 294   **Starting Line #** 38   **Section** 8.2.8.2.3

Floating and Figure numbering is messed up here. Figure 134 should come after Figures 130 and 133. There are ghost Figures 131 and 132 that don't appear, but affect the Figure numbering and appear in the table of contents as titleless figures.

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Relocate figure 134 nearby section 8.2.8.2.3
As figures 131 and 132 are missing please renumber figures 134, 129, 130, 133 accordingly (by this order)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **305**   **Comment submitted by:**   Jay   Klein

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 294   **Starting Line #** 40   **Section**

Renumber figure 134 and move nearby to section 8.2.8.2.3

Reason
Clarity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 304

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 306   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 294   **Starting Line #** 57   **Section** 8.2.8.2.3

Fix order of figures in the range 129-134.

Renumber to the range 129-132 (131 and 132 are not currently used)

Reason
Correct editorial error.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

See 304

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **307**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 298   **Starting Line #** 7   **Section** 9.2.2

Add a new line :
f) Service Flow Encodings (except Service Flow Identifier and Connection Identifier) (see 11.4.11)
g) Convergence Sublayer Parameter Encodings (see 11.4.16)

Reason
The Configuration File has the Service Flow Encodings as referred to the scope of the Service Flow Encodings.
Also has the Convergence Sublayer Parameter Encodings as referred in section 11.4.16 : "Configuration files will contain parameter information used by the convergence sublayers."

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Service flow info is not included in config file. The config file will be removed from the scope of service flow encodings

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **308**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 300   **Starting Line #** 22   **Section**   10.1

Add a rows
l BS l UCD Transitionl The time the BS must wait after repeating a UCD message with an incremented Configuration Change Count before issuing a UL-MAP message referring to burst descriptors defined in that UCD messagel 2ms l l l
  l BS l DCD Transitionl The time the BS must wait after repeating a DCD message with an incremented Configuration Change Count before issuing a DL-MAP message referring to burst descriptors defined in that DCD messagel 2ms l l l

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **309**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 300   **Starting Line #** 24   **Section** 10.1

To the description in the Maximum Value column, add "beyond the Allocation Start Time"

Reason
clarity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 310   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 301   **Starting Line #** 7   **Section** 10.1

line 7 Delete word 'Minimum' in time reference column.
line 14 Delete word 'maximum' in time reference column. Move value 30s from Minimum value column to Maximum value column

Reason
Current wording is very confusing

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do portion for line 7
Comment on line 14 superceeded.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **311**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 301   **Starting Line #** 14   **Section** 10.1

On page 301, line 14 change the name of "SS Configuration" to "T13"
On page 301, line 14 change the time Refernce field to read " The maximum time allowed for an SS, following receipt of a REG-RSP message to send a TFTP-CPLT message to the BS."
On page 301, line 14 change the Minimum and defalut columns to "15 min"
On page 302, line 28 change "REG-REQ" to "SBC-REQ"
On page 302, line 24 change the Minimum and Default columns to "300 ms"

Reason

When we changed the order of initialization we added SS Configuration whch is really a timer, but did not rectify it with the old timer T9 whose purpose was to ensure an SS didn't get stuck forever trying to TFTP its config file. The 15 min that T9 had was to allow for many retries. The 30 seconds is too short. Now the SBC follows ranging, not config file download and registration, so T9 must be much shorter.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 301, line 14 change the name of "SS Configuration" to "T13"
On page 301, line 14 change the time Refernce field to read " The time allowed for an SS, following receipt of a REG-RSP message to send a TFTP-CPLT message to the BS."
On page 301, line 14 change the Minimum and defalut columns to "15 min"
On page 302, line 28 change "REG-REQ" to "SBC-REQ"
On page 302, line 24 change the Minimum and Default columns to "300 ms"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **312**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 301   **Starting Line #** 20   **Section** 10.1

Put the Timers in numerical order, and group them together. In particular change the order of T12 and T14 on page 302.

Reason

Clarity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **313**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 302   **Starting Line #** 39   **Section** 10.1

Change the "Wait for RSX-RVD Timeout " to "Wait for DSX-RVD Timeout".

Reason
Erroneous text.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **314**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 303   **Starting Line #** 24   **Section** 10.2

Change the values for Authorization Grace Time to "3 hr (10,800 s)" and "3 days (259,200 s)" minimum value and default value.

Reason

Key Request messges are used to imply the receiving of a new AK. Authorization Grace Time MUST be long enough (significantly longer than TEK Grace Time) to guarantee at least one Key Request message is sent. Otherwise, the older AK may expire before the newer one is acknowledged, which leaves the SS without authorization and will be forced to redo network entry.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **315**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 303   **Starting Line #** 28   **Section** 8.2.8.2.1.2

{Note: the comment applies to D2. It is Scott Marin's Comment 1077 from LB#3 and was not previously considered.}

Delete para 8.2.3.2.1.1 and 8.2.3.2.1.2 or change "30" to "42" in 8.2.8.2.1.2.

Reason

Consider deleting or changing the limit. The limit serves no useful purpose in the 802.16 spec and can be deleted (if deleted then also consider deleting para 8.2.3.2.1.1). Alternatively, the limit should be replaced with text referring the reader to the applicable regulatory authority and the 802.16 co-existence practice. Finally, it the group still feels that a specific limit is necessary, then I recommend a limit of +42 dBW/MHz which matches the US FCC limit for 28 GHz LMDS subscriber terminals (CFR47 101.113 see note 9 in table). If the group still insists that a limit of +30 dBW/MHz be used then, I recommend that +30 dBW/MHz be a limit for clear-sky condistions and that up to +42 dBW/MHz be permitted under faded conditions. Note, current technology of 1 watt amplifiers and 42 dB Gain antennas for T1 links about 1MHz wide can easily produce an EIRP spectral density of +42 dBW/MHz, which subtantially exceeds the proposed limit of 30 dBW/MHz. Reducing the link margin by 12 dB (42 - 30) has a big impact on coverage area especially in rain zones with high rain rates. Note that +42 dBW/MHz is normally used only in faded conditions and that SSs normally operate at much lower EIRP levels during clear sky conditions.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

PHY Group Resolution:
Rejected
Several discussions in previous sessions have dealt with this issue.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:	**Ballot Number:** **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # 316   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 303   **Starting Line #** 47   **Section** 10.2

Delete lines 47-52 and the 1st sentence of the paragraph starting line 54. Also delete the word "recommended" on line 56.

Reason

No more table for recommened operational ranges.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **317**   **Comment submitted by:**   Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 304   **Starting Line #** 30   **Section** **10.3.1.1**

Change: "A Physical Slot (PS) is defined as the time to equal the duration of 4 modulation symbols at the symbol rate of the downlink transmission." to "A Physical Slot (PS) is defined as four consecutive modulation symbols."

Definitions belong in Clause 3. Can this one be moved there?

Reason

A PS is a chunk of symbols, not a duration of time.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do NOT make the above change

Instead make page 33 line 35 change "granularity" to "time"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

PS is a PHY dependent unit of time. As such the actual defintion is in the PHY section.
'unit of granularity' is a truely wierd redundant concept.

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **318**   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 306   **Starting Line #** 5   **Section** 11

Give numbers and captions to tables in Clause 11.

Reason

The whole TLV section has a lot of un-numbered, un-captioned tables that are not referenced in the text. This gets confusing.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Keep the editor busy ;)

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **319**   **Comment submitted by:**   Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 306   **Starting Line #** 16   **Section**   11.1.1.1

Change "Uplink center frequency (KHz)" to

Uplink center frequency in units of 250 KHz.

Reason

The resolution of 1 KHz is too tight taken into account the channel spacing.
A resolution of 250 KHz is easier and chepaer to achieve yet provides the necessary resolution for this application.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

PHY Group Resolution:
Accepted-Modified
In addition change the following:
(1) Pg. 306 ln. 16 "Uplink center frequency in KHz; Actual number rounded to multiples of 250 KHz "
(2) Pg. 306 ln. 12, change value to "5-40 MBaud, in increments of 100 KBaud"
(3) Pg. 306 ln 19 and ln 23 change "TDD" to "TDD and half-duplex FDD"

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Some system might need a fine granularity.

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 320   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 306   **Starting Line #** 34   **Section**   11.1.1.1

Add row to table

l Random Access Time-out l9l 1l Number of UL-MAPs to receive before random access is attempted againl

Reason

This parameter is needed to impose some kind of order to the random access scheme.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **321**   **Comment submitted by:**   Moritz   Harteneck

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 307   **Starting Line #** 15   **Section** 11.1.1.2

Remove '(Not Used if scrambler is off)' from Scrambler Seed Value description

Reason

I did not find any reference to the possibility to switch the scrambler off so this comment is misleading and confusing.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:　　　　　　　　**Ballot Number: 3 a**　　　　　　　　**Comment Date**

Comment # 322　　　　**Comment submitted by:** Lars　　　　Lindh

Change　　　**Type** Technical, Non-binding　　　**Starting Page #** 307　　**Starting Line #** 22　　**Section** 11.1.1.2

Insert one row in the UCD Burst Profile table defining a relative signal level for the profile. The relative signal level parameter shall define the amplitude of the corner constellation point for the modulation used.

Name	Type	Length	Value
Relative Signal Level	18	1	0-255

Reason

Depending on the uplink power control strategy the BS may want to maintain different relative power levels for the different modulation and coding schemes. As the power control algorithm is not standardized the SS has no means of knowing the preferred relative power levels for the BS. It is therefore proposed that the relative power level are communicated in the UCD Burst Profile message.
This procedure avoids an iterative power correction after a burst profile change.

Proposed Resolution　　　**Recommendation:**　　　　　　　**Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group　　　　**Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add to the table of section 11.1.1.1 the following entry:

Name: Power adjustment rule
Type: 9
Length: 1
Value: 0=Preserve Peak, 1=Preserve Mean Power; Describes the power adjustment rule when performing a transition from one burst profile to another

Furthermore, on page 287 ln. 45 add a new sentence after "... 8.2.4.4.8.":
In changing from one burst profile to another the power adjustment rule can be one of 2 choices: (1) Maintaining same constellation peaks (2) Maintaining same mean power. The power adjustment rule is configurable through UCD Channel Encoding parameters (table 11.1.1.1).

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3a** **Comment Date**

Comment # **323** **Comment submitted by:** Lars Lindh

Change **Type** Technical, Non-binding **Starting Page #** 308 **Starting Line #** 12 **Section** 11.1.2.1

Change "BS Transmit Power" to "BS transmit rms-Power"

Reason
Clarification

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change "BS Transmit Power" to "BS Transmit Power (average)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **324**   **Comment submitted by:** Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 308   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 11.1.2.1

Remove the Continuous FDD from the Table entry "Downlink PHY type".

Reason

The Continuous FDD refers to old PHY Mode A which doesn't exist now.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: **3a**

Comment Date

Comment # **325**   **Comment submitted by:**   Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 308   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 11.1.2.1

Downlink PHY type   1 = Burst FDD
                            2 = TDD

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On line 17 delete "(....)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **3 2 6**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 308   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 11.1.2.1

Delete the parenthetical remark.

Reason

The PHY Type codes are PHY specific and should not be elaborated here.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **327**   **Comment submitted by:**   Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 311   **Starting Line #** 36   **Section** 11.1.4

Change "in KHz" to "in units of 250 KHz"

Reason

The resolution of 1 KHz is too tight taken into account the channel spacing.
A resolution of 250 KHz is easier and chepaer to achieve yet provides the necessary resolution for this application.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

PHY Group Resolution:
Accepted-Modified
Change to " in KHz; Actual number rounded to multiples of 250 KHz ""

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Don't do the requested change but insert new section instead into PHY

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items
PHY group to provide the new section

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **328**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 311   **Starting Line #** 41   **Section** 11.1.4

Add "(not used with PHYs that do not have channelized uplinks)"

Reason

clarity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 329   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 313   **Starting Line #** 6   **Section**   11.2

Restore type 2 (Manufacturer-ID) and type 4 (RSA-Public-Key) from version D3d2 (see Table 114 of D3d2). Also restore the actual sections that define these two aatributes, i.e., 11.2.2 and 11.2.4 of D3d2 (see pages 341 and 341 of D3d2).

Reason

We need type 4 for SS certificate (see line 38 page 232) and type 2 for all vendor-defined attributes (see line 3 page 318). So, we need to restore type 2 and type 4.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Don't do the requested change.
Instead delete section 11.2.11 page 318.
Also on page 313 delete lines 49-52
on line 47 change "126" to "255"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **330**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 313   **Starting Line #** 9   **Section** 11.2
Change "AUTH-KEY" to "AUTH-Key"

Reason
Must match the name used, say for example, on page 86.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **3 3 1**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 316   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section** 11.2.7

Delete "(SAID)"

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 332   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 316   **Starting Line #** 48   **Section** 11.2.9

Change "HMAC-Digest attribute" to "CBC-IV attribute"

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **333**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 318   **Starting Line #** 12   **Section** 11.2.11

Change the length field to ">= 4" and delete "1-byte error code"

Reason
3-byte manufacturer ID and >= 1 byte vender-defined.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **334**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 319   **Starting Line #** 11   **Section** 11.2.14

Change the length to >= 4.

Reason

>= 3 bytes for suite list and 1 byte for version.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 335   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 320   **Starting Line #** 53   **Section** 11.2.15

Change "Suit" to "Suits"

Reason

typo

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change "Suite" to "Suites"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:　　　　　　　　　**Ballot Number:** **3 a**　　　　　　　　　　　　**Comment Date**

Comment # **336**　　　　**Comment submitted by:**　Stanley　　　Wang　　　　　　　　　Observer

Change　　　**Type** Editorial　　　　　　　**Starting Page #** 321　　　**Starting Line #** 1　　　　**Section** 11.2.16

Delete "Supported-"

Reason
see Table 110 type 21.

Proposed Resolution　　　**Recommendation:**　　　　　　　**Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group　　　　　**Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **337**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 321   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section** 11.2.16

Change "Cryptographic Suite" to "supported Cryptographic-Suite"

Reason

Clarification

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change "list of Cryptographic Suite parameters " to "list of supported Cryptographic-Suites "

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **338**   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 321   **Starting Line #** 9   **Section** 11.2.16

Change "6*n" to "3*n"

Reason

3 bytes for each suite (see 11.2.15)

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: Ballot Number: **3 a**   Comment Date

Comment # 339   **Comment submitted by:**   Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 321   **Starting Line #** 49   **Section** 11.2.18

Change the length field to "6"

Reason

2 bytes for SAID, 1 byte for SA-Type, and 3 bytes for Suite.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:　　　　　　　**Ballot Number:** **3a**　　　　　　　　　**Comment Date**

Comment # **340**　　　　**Comment submitted by:**　Stanley　　　　Wang　　　　　　　　　　Observer

Change　　　**Type** Editorial　　　　　　　**Starting Page #** 322　　　**Starting Line #** 40　　　**Section** 11.2.20

Change the lenght field to 3

Reason

1 byte for type and 2 bytes for CID.

Proposed Resolution　　**Recommendation:**　　　　　　　　**Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **3 4 1**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 326   **Starting Line #** 27   **Section** 11.3.4

The referenced paragraph does not exist. Add the correct reference.

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On line 25-26 delete "(....)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 3 4 2   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 327   **Starting Line #** 5   **Section** 11.3.5

Is 255 large enough? Does this limit us to MIBs <256 bytes or just to MIB fields of <256 bytes?

Reason

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**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **343**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 327   **Starting Line #** 35   **Section**   11.4.1

At this point the standard says that the Downlink Frequency Configuration Setting is used in the REG-REQ message. But at the section 6.2.2.4.7 Registration Request (REG-REQ) Message there is not any reference to the above parameter.

Reason

Generally the standard doesn't give a clear picture about the source of the Downlink Frequency Configuration Setting. Is it stored in the SS? Or is it a parameter that the SS gets from the provisioning server using TFTP ?
If the second apply then the scope column of section 11.4.1 must not have as scope the REG-REQ message because the SS gets the configuration file from the provisioning server (TFTP process) after completing the registration process (REG-REQ, REG-RSP).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Delete section 11.4.1

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 344   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 327   **Starting Line #** 52   **Section** 11.4.2

At this point the standard says that the Uplink Channel ID Configuration Setting is used in the REG-REQ message. But at the section 6.2.2.4.7 Registration Request (REG-REQ) Message there is not any reference to the above parameter.

Reason

Generally the standard doesn't give a clear picture about the source of Uplink Channel ID Configuration Setting. Is it stored in the SS ? Or is it a parameter that the SS gets from the provisioning server using TFTP ?
If the second apply then the scope column of section 11.4.2 must not have as scope the REG-REQ message because the SS gets the configuration file from the provisioning server (TFTP process) after completing the registration process (REG-REQ, REG-RSP).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Delete 11.4.2

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **345**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 327   **Starting Line #** 54   **Section** 11.4.1

Add the sentence "This TLV shall not be used with PHYs that do not support channelized uplinks"

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **346**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 328   **Starting Line #** 15   **Section** 11.4.3

replace starting with "including" on line 15 through line 25 with "limited to sending/receiving management traffic on its basic, primary, and secondary management channels."

Reason

The way its written now, an SS could use a data transport channel to TFTP files, etc.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **347**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 328   **Starting Line #** 30   **Section** 11.4.4

Remove the section 11.4.4 .

Reason

This section must be deleted because it belongs to the SS Capabilities Encoding which are referred to in section 11.4.5 .

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Safe delete as funtionality can be handled by SBC RSP

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **348**   **Comment submitted by:**   Lars   Lindh

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 328   **Starting Line #** 36   **Section**   11.4.5

The duplex characteristics for a terminal must be included in the SS Capabilities Encodings.

Type   Length   Value
5.12.7   1   bit#0: FDD full-duplex
                                      bit#1: FDD half-duplex
                                    bit#2: TDD
                                      bits#3-7 reserved

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace 11.4.5.6 with file "new section 11_4_5_6.fm"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **349**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 331   **Starting Line #** 37   **Section** 11.4.5.5

Add the sentence "Only one bit may be set."

Reason

These ara mutually exclusive modes in an SS.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **350**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 333   **Starting Line #** 30   **Section** 11.4.11.1

Delete lines 30-45

Reason

This existed only in the SSs config file to reference flows that had not been assigned a SFID yet. Those flows are no longer in the config file.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 351   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 334   **Starting Line #** 21   **Section** 11.4.11.3

Remove the "Configuration File" from the scope of Connection Identifier (CID).

Reason

The CID is given to the SS by the BS and it doesn't exist in the SS's Configuration File.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Do the above. Also do it on line 37.
Do it also on
p336 l. 47
p337 l. 50
p338 l. 42
p339 l. 7 ,l. 25, l. 53
p340 l. 21, l. 42
p341 l. 12, l. 30 ,l. 48
p342 l.20, l.39,
p.343 l. 12
p.345 l. 30 ,l. 38
p346 l. 12

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **352**   **Comment submitted by:**   Antonis   Karvelas

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 335   **Starting Line #** 24   **Section** 11.4.11.5

Replace the sentence :
"Multiple Service Flow Error Parameter Sets may appear in a REG-RSP, DSA-RSP, DSC-RSP, REG-ACK, DSA-ACK or DSC-ACK message, since multiple Service Flow parameters may be in error."
with the following :
"Multiple Service Flow Error Parameter Sets may appear in a DSA-RSP, DSC-RSP, DSA-ACK or DSC-ACK message, since multiple Service Flow parameters may be in error."

Reason
The Service Flow Encodings are not any more used in the Registration process (REG-REQ, REG-RSP).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Do the above and delete "REG-REQ," on line 29

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **353**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 338   **Starting Line #** 22   **Section** 11.4.11.8.1

Delete sentence ' For an uplink...'

Reason
No more deferred grants

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **354**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 338   **Starting Line #** 27   **Section** 11.4.11.8.1

Add "or discard non-conforming packets" to the end of the sentence.

Reason

Standard option for handling the situation in real communications systems.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **355**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 339   **Starting Line #** 53   **Section** 11.4.11.10

Put "R (in bits per second)" in the value field

Reason

completness, consistency with other rate parameters

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **356**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 340   **Starting Line #** 22   **Section** 11.4.11.11

Put "B (bytes)" in the Value field

Reason

completness, consistency with other size parameters

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**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **357**   **Comment submitted by:**   Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 342   **Starting Line #** 41   **Section** 11.4.11.17

Change 'Bit#1....' to read 'Bit#1-Reserved'

Reason

No more Priority request opportunities.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **3 5 8**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 343   **Starting Line #** 343   **Section**   11.4.11.19

If this section is not deleted, put "B (bytes)" in the value column.

Reason

completness, consistency with other size parameters

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **359**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 345   **Starting Line #** 8   **Section** 11.4.11.22

If this section is not deleted, change the length to "2" and delete "(0-127)"

Reason

As currently stated, this is insufficient for defining meaningful CBR traffic.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **360**   **Comment submitted by:** Stanley   Wang   Observer

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 346   **Starting Line #** 17   **Section** 11.4.11.26

Comment #1017 from LB #3 need to be implemented. It said:

Insert new section H4 reading 'Target SAID' reading
The target SAID parameter indicates the SAID that the service flow being set up shall be mapped onto. This parameter may only be used together with the Service Flow Identifier <ref to 11.4.12.2>.
lType   l Lengthl Value   l Scope   l
l 24.26 l 2   l SAID onto which SF is mappedl DSA-REQ (BS initiated), DSA-RSP (SS initiated)l

Reason
It was marked "accepted" and "done" but no change.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 346 line 17
Insert new section H4 reading 'Target SAID' reading
The target SAID parameter indicates the SAID that the service flow being set up shall be mapped onto. This parameter may only be used together with the Service Flow Identifier <ref to 11.4.11.2>.
lType   l Lengthl Value   l Scope   l
l [24/25].26 l 2   l SAID onto which SF is mappedl DSA-REQ (BS initiated), DSA-RSP (SS initiated)l

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 361   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 348   **Starting Line #** 39   **Section** 11.4.16

On line 39 break the paragraph into 2 paragraphs after the word "sublayers".
To the end of the first paragraph add the sentence "The following TLV defines the convergence sublayer to be used for a service flow."
After the new sentence, add a TLV table with the type field set to "99.0", the length field set to "1", and the value field identical to the value field of the table at line 47.

Reason
Otherwise a connection's CS is merely implied by its other TLVs rather than explicitly stated.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number: 3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 362   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 348   **Starting Line #** 39   **Section** 11.4.16

Change "Configuration files" to "DSx messages"

Reason

This information is no longer in the config file.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **363**   **Comment submitted by:** Carl   Eklund

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 348   **Starting Line #** 56   **Section** 11.4.16.1

Make the layout of the section consistent with other section defining TLVs e.g. make the tap separated tables properly formatted tables

Reason

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Make the layout of the section consistent with other section defining TLVs e.g. make the tab separated tables properly formatted tables

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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:

Ballot Number: 3 a   **Comment Date**

Comment # 364   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 349   **Starting Line #** 1   **Section** 11.4.16.1.1

Delete lines 1 through 23

Reason

These parameters are no in the config file or regsitration message and are redundant with the exact same TLVs in sections 11.4.16.1.6 and 11.4.16.1.10.1

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **365**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 349   **Starting Line #** 24   **Section** 11.4.16.1.1.3

Move page 349, lines 24-39 to page 350, line 10.

On page 349, line 36, change "99.1.28" to "99.1.5.1"

Reason
This is an SS capability, not a config file parameter.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

On page 349, line 36, change "99.1.28" to "99.1.5.1"
Move page 349, lines 24-39 to page 350, line 10.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **366**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 350   **Starting Line #** 13   **Section** 11.4.16.1.3.2

Change the sentence to "If the value field is a 1, the SS supports Packet CS payload header supression."

Reason

By definition of where this TLV is defined, it is describing an SS capability, not making a request.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **367**   **Comment submitted by:** Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 351   **Starting Line #** 3   **Section** 11.4.16.1.7.1

Delete lines 3-12.

Reason

Since the classifier no longer is in the config file, the classifier reference is unnecessary. The BS returns the classifier identifier in the DSA-REQ or DSA-RSP message.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **368**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 357   **Starting Line #** 53   **Section** 11.4.16.1.10.2

Delete page 357, line 53 through page 358, line 30.

Reason

These are redundant with previously defined TLVs. There is no need to re-specify them for PHS.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **369**   **Comment submitted by:**   Ken   Stanwood

Change   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 358   **Starting Line #** 23   **Section** 11.4.16.1.10.5

If this section is not deleted, delete the last sentence, including the parenthetical remark.

Reason

This is an old DOCSIS rule. We don't have prmary downlink service flows, and even if we did, we wouldn't associate all PHS rules with them and only them.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 370   **Comment submitted by:** Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 363   **Starting Line #** 44   **Section** 13

Review Bibliography list for editorial corrections to harmonize the style with IEEE conventions.

Also, check for correct cross-references in text.

Reason
Editorial.

Cross-references were mentioned in Comment 367 of Letter Ballot #3; this comment was marked "defer to next round".

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

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: **Ballot Number:** **3 a**   **Comment Date**

Comment # 371   **Comment submitted by:**   Roger   Marks   Member

Change   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 363   **Starting Line #** 44   **Section**   13

Add [I.530], [I.452] to bibliograhy.

Reason
Cited on p. 292 (lines 47 &57)

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**
Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items