Comment by: Peter Ecclesine **Membership Status:** Member **Date:** 17-Dec-2009

Comment # F0001 **Document under Review:** P802.16h/D13 **Ballot ID:** sb_16hR6

Comment **Type** Editorial **Part of Dis** ☐ **Satisfied** ☐ **Page** 149 **Line** 45 **Fig/Table#** **Subclause** 15.6.1.2

The two sentences should be combined, like the preceeding sentence. "The various Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the configuration number. The various
Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the IEBSS number, which runs from 1 to 199."

Suggested Remedy

The various Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the IEBSS configuration number, which runs from 1 to 199.

GroupResolution **Decision of Group:** **Principle**

1. Replace :."The various Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the configuration number. The various Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the IEBSS number, which runs from 1 to 199." with:
"The various Interference Evaluation Bursts transmitted by the BS are identified by the configuration number. The various Interference Evaluation Bursts transmitted by the SS are identified by the IEBSS number, which runs from 1 to 199."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

In TLV 19, clause 11.30, page 47, the word "configuration" refers to BS

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** a) done

Comment by: Peter Ecclesine **Membership Status:** Member **Date:** 17-Dec-2009

Comment # F0002 **Document under Review:** P802.16h/D13 **Ballot ID:** sb_16hR6

Comment **Type** Editorial **Part of Dis** ☐ **Satisfied** ☐ **Page** 140 **Line** 44 **Fig/Table#** **Subclause** 15.5.3.6.6

The two sentences should be combined, like the preceeding sentence. "The various Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the configuration number. The various
Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the IEBSS number, which runs from 1 to

Suggested Remedy

The various Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the IEBSS configuration number, which runs from 1 to 199.

GroupResolution **Decision of Group:** **Principle**

1. Replace :."The various Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the configuration number. The various Interference Evaluation Bursts are identified by the IEBSS number, which runs from 1 to 199." with:
"The various Interference Evaluation Bursts transmitted by the BS are identified by the configuration number. The various Interference Evaluation Bursts transmitted by the SS are identified by the IEBSS number, which runs from 1 to 199."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

In TLV 19, clause 11.30, page 47, the word "configuration" refers to BS

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** a) done

Comment by: Peter Ecclesine **Membership Status:** Member **Date:** 17-Dec-2009

Comment # F0003 **Document under Review:** P802.16h/D13 **Ballot ID:** sb_16hR6

Comment **Type** Editorial **Part of Dis** ☐ **Satisfied** ☐ **Page** 47 **Line** 32 **Fig/Table#** **Subclause** 11.3

Element 19 IEBSS - There is no mention of values 200, 221-227 anywhere in the draft.

Suggested Remedy

In 15.3.5.2, explain the setting and use of those values (and clarify 200 to 220 - IEBSS 1 to 21?)).

GroupResolution **Decision of Group:** **Principle**

1. Delete in TLV 15, clause 11.30, the text related to values 221-255;
2. Indicate the values 221-255 as "reserved".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Value 200 is part of the IEBBS (first configuration). The usage mode for the values 221-227 was discarded in the changes to 15.3.5.2, in the last recircs.

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** a) done

Interference Evaluation Burst identifier:
1- IEBSS1 of this system
2- IEBSS2 of this system
...
199- IEBSS199 of this system
200- IEBBS1 of this system
201- IEBBS2 of this system
...
220- IEBBS20 of this system
221-255 reserved

Comment by: Jonathan Labs **Membership Status:** Member **Date:** 5-Jan-2010

Comment # F0004 **Document under Review:** P802.16h/D13 **Ballot ID:** sb_16hR6

Comment **Type** Technical **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐ **Page** 34 **Line** 59 **Fig/Table#** **Subclause** 8.4.14.5

I am dissatisfied with the resolutions to comments E8 and E11. Both comments address changes to the physical layer which are out of scope of the PAR. The PAR's scope states: "This amendment specifies improved mechanisms, as policies and medium access control enhancements, to enable
coexistence among license-exempt systems based on IEEE Standard 802.16 and to facilitate the coexistence of such systems with primary users."

Suggested Remedy

Reconsider the proposed resolutions to E8 and E11 in IEEE 802.16-09/0062r3.

GroupResolution **Decision of Group:** **Principle**

- delete 8.4.14.5
- delete in clause 11.11 the entry 1.19 and adjust the numbering of the following entries
- delete on page 42 the text: "The Saturation Indication shows if an SS has a radio front-end saturated in the receive state, during a specific frame. Following a Saturation Indication Report, the BS will schedule the transmissions to this SS in a frame in which the saturation does not appear. Note that CX-Frame is constituted from 4 frames."

Page 43: delete the text between rows 53 on page 43 to row 24 on page 44.
Page 10 line 1: Replace: "Systems compliant with clause 12.8 shall support the following TLVs: Frame-specific CINR Report, Framespecific
RSSI Report, Saturation indication." with "Systems compliant with clause 12.8 shall support the following TLVs: Frame-specific CINR Report, Frame-specific RSSI Report."
Page 119, line 63: delete "Saturation Indication Report, as indicated in clause 11.11 and 11.12."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** a) done

Comment by: Jonathan Labs **Membership Status:** Member **Date:** 5-Jan-2010

Comment # F0005 **Document under Review:** P802.16h/D13 **Ballot ID:** sb_16hR6

Comment **Type** Technical **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐ **Page** 33 **Line** 32 **Fig/Table#** **Subclause** 8.4.5.3.34

I am dissatisfied with the resolutions to comments E8 and E11.
There are other instances of PHY changes which are out of scope of the PAR: Section 8.4.5.3.34 states, "WirelessMAN-CX and WirelessMAN-UCP systems that operate in a mode where the BS may intentionally refrain from transmitting in a given DL subframe shall include the TxCNT IE in the DL-MAP to allow an SS to determine that a previous missing DL subframe was intentionally not transmitted by comparing the incrementing of the Tx Count to the incrementing of the frame number. Transmission count is incremented by 1 for every DL subframe transmission." In IEEE 802.16-2009, however, it is specified in 8.4.4.1 that "Each frame in the DL transmission begins with a preamble followed by a DL transmission period and an UL transmission period." A BS is not allowed to intentionally refrain from transmitting.

Suggested Remedy

Delete Section 8.4.5.3.34

GroupResolution **Decision of Group:** **Agree**

Instruction to Editor:
1. Delete also, on page 33 line 13, the TxCNT_IE entry from the DL MAP Extended IE; after deletion adjust the numbering in the table
2. after the deletion of 8.4.5.3.4 adjust the numbering of the folowing clause
3. After all the changes up-date the ToC

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** a) done

8.4.5.3.34

Comment by: Jonathan Labs **Membership Status:** Member **Date:** 5-Jan-2010 19:

Comment # F0006 **Document under Review:** P802.16h/D13 **Ballot ID:** sb_16hR6

Comment **Type** Technical **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐ **Page** 34 **Line** 49 **Fig/Table#** **Subclause** 8.4.14.3.2

I am dissatisfied with the resolutions to comments E8 and E11.
There are other instances of PHY changes which are out of scope of the PAR: Section 8.4.14.3.2 states, "The BS receiver shall be capable of decoding a maximum on-channel signal of -45 dBm in macro cell applications and a maximum signal of -35 dBm in micro cell applications."
This is changing the requirements at the PHY layer. In IEEE 802.16-2009 it is stated that all BS receivers shall be capable of decoding a maximum on-channel signal of -45 dBm.
(In addition, neither "micro cell" nor "macro cell" are defined terms in either IEEE 802.16-2009 or in P802.16h/D13.)

Suggested Remedy

Delete Section 8.4.14.3.2.

GroupResolution **Decision of Group:** **Agree**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** a) done

It's the only change in 8.4.14, all the titles under 8.4.14 are also removed from the draft.

Comment by: Lei Wang **Membership Status:** Member **Date:** 5-Jan-2010 17: 2:

Comment # F0007 **Document under Review:** P802.16h/D13 **Ballot ID:** sb_16hR6

Comment **Type** Technical **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐ **Page** 99 **Line** 56 **Fig/Table#** **Subclause** 15.4

I am not satified with the resolution of my comment, E12, in the comment database 80216-09_0062r2.cmt.
This comment is a continuation of multiple previous comments that were centered on PAR scope issues related to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. The 802.16h amendment still contains features and references pertaining to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. Using the argument that there is an implicit assumption that the amendment needs to coexist with other systems is not valid; in this case the amendment is clearly targeting inappropriate band. The amendment IEEE P802.16h/D13 contains 16 references to 'bursty systems'. 'Bursty systems' within the sense of the amendment are defined and exemplified by the term Wireless LANs. Furthermore there is 1 references '802.11'. Coexistence with these or other systems is out of scope and therefore any specification should be removed. Specification of coexistence with 'bursty systems' is focused in section 15.4.1 and its sub sections specifically 15.4.1.4.1, and uses the feature name of 'CX-CBP'. Section 15.4.1.4 makes specific mention of coexistence with systems other than 802.16 systems.
Furthermore, I have some big issues with the following response given to my comment E12 in the comment database 80216-09_0062r2.cmt.
/** start of a given response
The 802.16h PAR Scope includes "facilitate the coexistence of such systems with primary users", where "such systems" refer to 802.16-based systems.The Radio LANs, also called "Wireless LANs", were identified by ITU-R Resolution 229 (WRC-03) as part of the primary WAS (Wireless Access Systems) in 5GHz. This issue was also addressed in the presentation 802.16h-09/0017r1, given at Session #63. The text in the Resolution 229 says: "The World Radiocommunication Conference (Geneva, 2003), considering a) that this Conference has allocated the bands 5 150-5 350 MHz and 5 470-5 725 MHz on a primary basis to the mobile service for the implementation of wireless access systems (WAS), including radio local area networks (RLANs);"With no doubt the coexistence with wireless LANs and 802.11, having a "primary" status in 5GHz, is in the scope of the 802.16h PAR.
/** end of a given response
Here're my big issues with the above given response to my comment E12:
1) Clearly there is a bad logic in the argument: generalize very specific bands of an ITU-R recommendation to a widely common usage, i.e., generalize the ITU recommendation for the bands 5 150-5 350 MHz and 5 470-5 725 MHz to a common usage. Please note that the 802.16h is about licence-exempt operations, it is about frequencey bands and regulatory rules, which are totally specific to frequency bands and/or regions. We really cannot generalize the use of the regulatory documents.In other words, even you can find an ITU-R document to show the "primary" status of Wiless LANs in the bands 5 150-5 350 MHz and 5 470-5 725 MHz, but for sure you cannot claim the "primary status" of Wireless LANs in other bands, e.g., 3.65GHz bands.
2) The above given response is misleading by mixing up the concepts about "primary service" and "primary user". Note that the "primary user" is used in the 16h PAR, howerver, the ITU-R documents does not have such a concept at all, instead, the have the concept of "primary service". I don't think primary service equals primary user, or just generalize it as "primary".

Suggested Remedy

I would like to propose the following two options of remedies:
options-1:

Delete section 15.4.1 and its subsections to remove specification of coexistence with 'bursty systems'. Remove other coexistence features related to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. Remove all references to 'bursty systems' throughout the draft and align the remaining specification accordingly. Remove all references to explicit coexistence with '802.11' systems throughout the draft and align the remaining specification accordingly. In light of these far reaching and extensive changes the document may have to be sent back to the Working Group for redrafting.
option-2:
in line 16 page 100 of P802.16h/D13, insert the following sentence:
This Section only applies to the frequency bands 5 150-5 350 MHz and 5 470-5 725 MHz.

GroupResolution **Decision of Group:** **Principle**

Replace on page 105: "In specific bands and regulatory domains, such as the 3.65-3.7GHz band in US and the 5GHz bands in Europe, there is a requirement for the implementation of a coexistence protocol."
with: "This section only applies to license-exempt frequency bands allocated by national/regional/international regulations for primary services using Bursty systems"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** a) done

Replace on page 105: "In specific bands and regulatory domains, such as the 3.65-3.7GHz band in US and the 5GHz bands in Europe, there is a requirement for the implementation of a coexistence protocol.CX-CBP is such a protocol."
with: "This section only applies to license-exempt frequency bands allocated by national/regional/international regulations for primary services using Bursty systems"