Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   Comment Date

Comment # **4018**   **Comment submitted by:** Tal   Kaitz   Member   2005/04/28

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 17   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#** 7a   **Section** 6.3.2.1.2.1

The UL-Tx-Power field is sometimes defined as 7 bits and sometimes as 8 bits, with conflicting definitions of quantization:

In PHY channel report header it is 7 bits
In table 7a it is UL-Tx-Power is 8 bits
In table 7d it is UL-Tx-Power is 7 bits
In figure 20a it is 8 bits.

In table 7a description, the defined quantization for the "8"-bit field is –16.0 dB to 47.5 dB in units of 0.5 dB, which is actually 7-bit quantization. However the same field also as reference to section 11.1.1 in the base document which truely defines 8-bit quantization (-64dbm...63.5dbm in steps of 0.5dB).

Suggested Remedy
Align the UL-Tx-Power fields and quantization with the base document:

1) figure 20d: change size of 'UL-Tx-Power' field in figure 20d to 8 bits, at the expense of 1 reserved bit.

2) table 7d:
- Increase length of 'UL-Tx-Power' field in table 7d from 7 to 8 bits, at the expense of 1 reserved bit..
- Replace description of the field with:
     "UL Tx power level in dBm, for the burst that carries this Header (see section 11.1.1) , from +63 to 64 in dBm in 1 dB steps. The maximum value is shall be reported for the burst."

3) remove text on page 17, lines 35-39.
4) remove the reserved bit from table 7a so that the number of bits in the table is byte-aligned.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**
Align the UL-Tx-Power fields and quantization with the base document:

1) figure 20d: change size of 'UL-Tx-Power' field in figure 20d to 8 bits, at the expense of 1 reserved bit.

2) table 7d:
- Increase length of 'UL-Tx-Power' field in table 7d from 7 to 8 bits, at the expense of 1 reserved bit..
- Replace description of the field with:
     "UL Tx power level in dBm, for the burst that carries this Header (see section 11.1.1) , from +63 to 64 in dBm in 1 dB steps. The maximum value is shall be reported for the burst."

3) remove text on page 17, lines 35-39.
4) remove the reserved bit from table 7a so that the number of bits in the table is byte-aligned.

Reason for Recommendation

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

Align the UL-Tx-Power fields and quantization with the base document:

1) figure 20d: change size of 'UL-Tx-Power' field in figure 20d to 8 bits, at the expense of 1 reserved bit.

2) table 7d:
- Increase length of 'UL-Tx-Power' field in table 7d from 7 to 8 bits, at the expense of 1 reserved bit..
- Replace description of the field with:
    "UL Tx power level in dBm, for the burst that carries this Header (see section 11.1.1) , from +63
    to -64 in dBm in 1 dB steps. The maximum value is shall be reported for the
    burst."

3) remove text on page 17, lines 35-39.
4) remove the reserved bit from table 7a so that the number of bits in the table is byte-aligned.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

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

This resolution is confusing. I think the commenter is actually talking about Figure 20a, but in that figure, UL Tx Power is 8 bits. Also, I think the table is actually 7a, and that part makes sense. I didn't change the figure, but I did make the table adjustments.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review:	**P802.16e/D7**	Ballot Number:	**0001037**		Comment Date
Comment # **4094**	Comment submitted by:	Phillip	Barber	Member	2005/04/28
Comment	Type **Technical, Binding**	Starting Page # **88**	Starting Line # **47**	Fig/Table#	Section **6.3.2.3.47**

I object to the resolution of comment 2095.

Resolution of comment 2095 removed reference and mechanics of the 'Neighbor Preference' from the Neighbor Advertisement (NBR-ADV) message. This feature had previously been added after substantial harmonization activity on NBR-ADV and reflected a perceived need by the group for BS broadcasting the NBR-ADV message to give a subjective/bias indication to MS receiving the message as to which Neighbor BS the Serving BS would prefer MS target for initial network entry as well as handover.

The reason that this mechanic was removed through the resolution of 2095 was because of a perceived lack of defined/structured mechanics for objective differentiation of the various selection responses. Specifically, how does a given BS know whether to declare one neighbor BS a 'Preferred BS' and another neighbor BS a 'Normal BS'. While I agree that no objective mechanics were defined, that rational for removal is flawed. It was always intended that selection of 'type' of Neighbor Preference would be entirely subjective; that this was a hook for different vendors to apply differing criteria in determining individual Neighbor Preference. For some networks, it might be based on some CINR threshold; on others it might be based on sector granularity for differently configured cells; for others it might be differentiating between pico, micro, and macro cells. The point is that it was entirely subjective, and there was nothing wrong with that. It would not interfere with interoperable performance to have this feature subjectively assigned, and inclusion provides a simple mechanism for networks to direct entering or re-entering MS toward neighbor BS that would in some way benefit the network; though the activity is not enforced through this mechanism.

Finally, through use of the new 'Skip-Optional-Fields bitmap' implementors of the standard need not use this feature, nor suffer the 1 byte transmission penalty, should they elect not to use this optional feature.

Suggested Remedy

In 6.3.2.3.47, Table 106d, page 91, line 16:
Insert before '}'
'reserved | 6 bits | Shall be set to zero
Neighbor Preference | 2 bits | 00 Normal
                                                01 Preferred
                                                10 Non-Preferred
                                                 11 Reserved'

In 6.3.2.3.47, page 93, line 14
Insert before '**DCD Configuration Change Count'**
' Neighbor Preference
The Neighbor Preference field is present only if bit #3 of Skip-Optional-Fields bitmap is '0'. It defines an implementation specific, subjective preference for MS network entry and handover to neighbor BS, as determined by the serving BS (see section 6.3.21.1.1.1)'

Add section 6.3.21.1.1, page 151, line 40:
Insert new section 6.3.21.1.1.1
' **6.3.21.1.1.1 Neighbor preference**
The message element "Neighbor Preference" in MOB_NBR-ADV MAC Management message defines a subjective assignment of handover priorities or preferences as determined and set by the serving base station. The serving BS may consider factors including, but not limited to, neighbor BS CINR service threshold, configuration including sectorization and service granularity support, coverage footprint, current loading, and QoS support in deciding to report a BS as a handover candidate, according to the rules specified by a handover policy management entity

out-of-scope of this standard. Neighbor Preference is a mechanism to permit a serving BS to influence MS decisions for network entry and handover. MS may use information obtained through Neighbor Preference to prejudice a decision on which BS to conduct initial network entry, or to construct and prioritize BS in a MOB_MSHO-REQ message.'

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

In 6.3.2.3.47, Table 106d, page 91, line 16:
Insert before '}'
'reserved | 6 bits | Shall be set to zero
Neighbor Preference | 2 bits | 00 Normal
                            01 Preferred
                            10 Non-Preferred
                             11 Reserved'

In 6.3.2.3.47, page 93, line 14
Insert before '**DCD Configuration Change Count'**
' Neighbor Preference
The Neighbor Preference field is present only if bit #3 of Skip-Optional-Fields bitmap is '0'. It defines an implementation specific, subjective preference for MS network entry and handover to neighbor BS, as determined by the serving BS (see section 6.3.21.1.1.1)'

Add section 6.3.21.1.1, page 151, line 40:
Insert new section 6.3.21.1.1.1
' **6.3.21.1.1.1 Neighbor preference**
The message element "Neighbor Preference" in MOB_NBR-ADV MAC Management message defines a subjective assignment of handover priorities or preferences as determined and set by the serving base station. The serving BS may consider factors including, but not limited to, neighbor BS CINR service threshold, configuration including sectorization and service granularity support, coverage footprint, current loading, and QoS support in deciding to report a BS as a handover candidate, according to the rules specified by a handover policy management entity out-of-scope of this standard. Neighbor Preference is a mechanism to permit a serving BS to influence MS decisions for network entry and handover. MS may use information obtained through Neighbor Preference to prejudice a decision on which BS to conduct initial network entry, or to construct and prioritize BS in a MOB_MSHO-REQ message.'

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Vote: 8-4
For handoff, this capability already exists since target BS list is sorted by preference. This capability provides no real benefit for initial entry as the MS would not yet have a serving BS.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **4221**   **Comment submitted by:** Tal   Kaitz   Member   2005/04/28

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 246   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#**   **Section** 8.4.5.3

In OFDMA, the DL subframe is comprised of multiple zones, each signaled using a zone-switch IE. Currently, the text does not address the possibility to specify multiple zone switch IEs that define zones that overlap, or partially overlap, in time.

Allowing overlapping zones is an attractive scheme for certain deployments utilizing SDMA, for the following reasons:

1) Such a scheme does not require special MSS demodulation capabilities or multiple antennas at the MSS; the SS is only required to demodulate the one zone in which its burst is located, and spatial processing at the BS ensures separation.

2) Each of the overlapping zones uses different zone IDcell values, leading to averaging of interference caused from imperfect spatial separation between transmission of overlapping zones. Interference averaging is achieved both through permutation and through different pilot scrambling (subcarrier randomization) sequences.

Additional restrictions are put on the definition to simplify MSS implementation:
- Zones shall not partially overlap.
- At most three zones may overlap another zone.
- All DL-MAP IEs describing bursts in overlapping zones shall include a CID.
- In any given frame, the BS shall not allocate bursts for any specific SS in more than one of the overlapping zones. This includes both unicasts and multicasts.

Suggested Remedy
Add new section 8.4.5.3.xx

8.4.5.3.xx Enhanced STC/Zone switch IE format for DL

The Enhanced STC/zone switch IE may be used to define zones that overlap an existing downlink zone defined using STC/zone switch IE (see section 8.4.5.3.4). Enhanced STC/Zone switch IEs shall be specified in the DL-MAP immediately following the STC/zone switch IE that refers to the zone over which they overlap.

Enhanced DL zones may overlap a DL zone under the following restrictions:
- At most three enhanced zones may be defined to overlap any single DL zone.
- All DL-MAP IEs describing bursts in overlapping zones shall include a CID.
- Zones shall not partially overlap.
- In any given frame, the BS shall not allocate bursts for any specific SS in more than one of the overlapping zones. This includes both unicast and multicast allocations.

The format of the Enhanced STC/Zone switch IE is the same as the format of the STC/zone switch IE defined in table 279, with the first two fields replaced by the following fields:

Extended-2 DIUC   4   Enhanced_STC_Zone_Switch = 0x0B
Length   8

Modify the table in section 11.8.3.7.5, page 532, as follows:

...

...

Bit #4: TUSC2 support

Bit #5: Support for Enhanced DL zones

Bit #~~5~~ 6-7: Reserved, shall be set to zero

...

...

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The comment is only applicable to the AAS case, which is already addressed by another comment (see 4226).

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **4276**   **Comment submitted by:** Tal   Kaitz   Member   2005/04/28

Comment   Type Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 354   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#**   **Section** 8.4.5.4.15

CQICH type field was added to CQI Enhanced Allocation IE format.

1) The 4-bit CQI encoding defined in 802.16-2004 is missing from the list of types.

2) It is not clear what DIUC-CQI actually is. To which DIUC does this refer? even if that was known, what is modulated on the 48 subcarriers of the CQI channel and in what order ? None of this seems to be defined.

Suggested   Remedy
1) Modify table 302a:
- replace '0b01 = DIUC-CQI' with '0b01 = 4-bit CQI (see section 8.4.5.4.10)'
- delete the last sentence in the 'CQICH Type' entry:
~~A DIUC-CQI is a CQI channel that uses a modulation~~
~~and coding level derived from the DIUC.~~

2) Remove all references to DIUC-CQI from the standard.

Proposed   Resolution   Recommendation: **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**
1) Modify table 302a:
- replace '0b01 = DIUC-CQI' with '0b01 = 4-bit CQI (see section 8.4.5.4.10)'
- delete the last sentence in the 'CQICH Type' entry:
~~A DIUC-CQI is a CQI channel that uses a modulation~~
~~and coding level derived from the DIUC.~~

2) Remove all references to DIUC-CQI from the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
DIUC-CQI has technical merit and should not be removed.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes　　　　　　　　**Editor's Actions**　　l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review:	**P802.16e/D7**	**Ballot Number:** **0001037**	**Comment Date**
Comment # **4287**	**Comment submitted by:** Tal	Kaitz	Member	2005/04/28

Comment **Type**	Technical, Binding	**Starting Page #** 403	**Starting Line #** 12	**Fig/Table#**	**Section** 8.4.6.1.2.1.1

The 802.16e text (as well as Cor1 text) defines the values of 'IDcell' used for the two equations that define the PUSC permutation (cluster permutation defined in section 8.4.6.1.2.1.1 and 'inner permutation' defined in eq. (111)). For PUSC zones with zone-switch IE indicator 'use all SC=0', the cluster permutation is initialized with IDcell = 0. However for PUSC zones defined with 'use all SC=0', the IDcell value specified in the zone_switch_IE is the same one used for both the inner and cluster permutations. .

The coupling between inner and cluster permutations when 'use all SC=1' adds an unneeded restriction on the system design. For zones with 'use all SC=1', separate values should be used for the inner and cluster permutations of PUSC.

Decoupling these values has merit because PUSC permutation hit-ratio properties highly depend on the IDcell value used; hence better optimization of hit-ratio can be achieved by selecting distinct IDcell values for the different components of the permutation

The proposal is to add a DCD TLV that specifies an independent value for the PUSC cluster permutation, overriding the current definition. Backward compatibility since the default operation is left unchanged, and the BS can make sure not to allocate resources to legacy SSs in zones where the default was overriden.

This does not add any complexity to MSS design since it already needs to support all possible IDcell values for both inner and cluster permutation equations in PUSC

Suggested Remedy
[Add the following field to table 358 (DCD channel encodings):]

DL_ClusterPermBase	XXX	1	Value used in the clustering renumbering formula described in section 8.4.6.1.2.1.1, for PUSC zones for which the indicator 'use all SC' = 1.	OFDMA

[modify text on page 403, lines 12-15]

LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence((PhysicalCluster+13*~~IDcell~~ DL_ClusterPermBase) mod Nclusters)
~~In~~ the first PUSC zone of the downlink (first downlink zone), the default used ~~IDcell~~ DL_ClusterPermBase is 0. When the 'Use all SC indicator=0' in the STC_DL_Zone_IE(), DL_ClusterPermBase is replaced with 0. For All other cases DL_ClusterPermBase parameter transmitted in the DCD message shall be used, or, if the parameter was not transmitted in a DCD message, the IDcell parameter in the STC_DL_Zone_IE() shall be used.

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

Apply (inserting an appropriate value for 'XXX'):
[Add the following field to table 358 (DCD channel encodings):]

DL_ClusterPermBase	XXX	1	Value used in the clustering renumbering formula described in section 8.4.6.1.2.1.1, for PUSC zones for which the indicator	OFDMA

section 5. 116.1.2.1.1.1, for PUSC zones for which the indicator 'use all SC' = 1.

[modify text on page 403, lines 12-15]

LogicalCluster = RenumberingSequence((PhysicalCluster+13*~~IDcell~~ DL_ClusterPermBase) mod Nclusters)
~~In~~ the first PUSC zone of the downlink (first downlink zone), the default used ~~IDcell~~ DL_ClusterPermBase is 0. When the 'Use all SC indicator=0' in the STC_DL_Zone_IE(), DL_ClusterPermBase is replaced with 0. For All other cases DL_ClusterPermBase parameter transmitted in the DCD message shall be used, or, if the parameter was not transmitted in a DCD message, the IDcell parameter in the STC_DL_Zone_IE() shall be used.

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Vote: 1-6
Unnecessary feature, and requires a change in Corr1

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **4292**   **Comment submitted by:** Tal   Kaitz   Member   2005/04/28

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 430   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#**   **Section** 8.4.7

802.16-2004 defines an initial ranging scheme that is based on transmitting either one or two CDMA codes over 6 subchannels (8 with optional PUSC).

However, these schemes do not work well when the deployment consists of a multiple-antenna BS (a supported configuration of 802.16-2004) and a power limited SS that requires either repetition or mini-subchannels for its operation. In such scenarios, the code misdetection rate can go as high as 25% for a 1% false alarm rate. With a single-antenna BS, detection performance is only marginal.

These results are obtained under optimistic assumptions: time offset is perfectly known, a single code hypothesis, no contention on the ranging slot.

Suggested Remedy
Consider and adopt contribution C802.16e-05/251.

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Out of scope (new capability).

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   Comment Date

Comment # **4320**   **Comment submitted by:** Tal   Kaitz   Member   2005/04/28

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 489   **Starting Line #** 30   **Fig/Table#**   **Section** 8.4.11.3

The current 802.16e SINR reporting mechanism requires the MSS to report a straightforward CINR measurement. This mechanism does not provide the BS with any knowledge on the frequency selectivity of the channel and noise (especially prominent with partially loaded cells and with multipath). This knowledge is important since, contrary to the AWGN channel, in a frequency selective channel there is no 1 to 1 relation between amount of increase in power and amount of improvement in "effective SINR" . Furthermore, the relation is dependent on MCS level. This results in larger fade margins, which translates directly to reduction in capacity.

In this contribution we propose a mechanism based on the "Exponential Effective SIR Mapping" (EESM) model that provides the BS with sufficient knowledge on the channel-dependent relationship between power increase, MCS change and improvement in effective SINR.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution 802.16e-05/141r2 "CINR measurements using the EESM method"

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

Adopt contribution 802.16e-05/141r3"CINR measurements using the EESM method"

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Vote: 9-16
Reason: Existing methods are sufficient, and this method adds overhead.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   Comment Date

Comment # **4321**   **Comment submitted by:** Vladimir   Yanover   Member   2005/04/28

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 489   **Starting Line #** 30   **Fig/Table#**   **Section** 8.4.11.3

The current 802.16e SINR reporting mechanism requires the MSS to report a straightforward CINR measurement. This mechanism does not provide the BS with any knowledge on the frequency selectivity of the channel and noise (especially prominent with partially loaded cells and with multipath). This knowledge is important since, contrary to the AWGN channel, in a frequency selective channel there is no 1 to 1 relation between amount of increase in power and amount of improvement in "effective SINR" . Furthermore, the relation is dependent on MCS level. This results in larger fade margins, which translates directly to reduction in capacity.

In this contribution we propose a mechanism based on the "Exponential Effective SIR Mapping" (EESM) model that provides the BS with sufficient knowledge on the channel-dependent relationship between power increase, MCS change and improvement in effective SINR.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution 802.16e-05/141r2 "CINR measurements using the EESM method"

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 4320.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **4332**   **Comment submitted by:** Tal   Kaitz   Member   2005/04/28

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 508   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#** 353a   **Section** 11.3.1

Section 8.4.10.3.1 defines a new triggering mechanism for UL Tx power and headroom report by the MSS. The text spefically defines the messages used for automatic transmission of these reports.

The last sentence states:
"In UCD, there are sets of those parameters sets: Depending on the allocation CQICH to SS, the corresponding parameter set shall be used."

Additional references to CQICH appear in table 353a, 'Tx power report' entry.

This is not clear:
1) In UCD the parameter themselves are defined, not 'sets of parameter sets'.
2) Why and how is this mechanism related to CQICH? no clear specification or explanation is given.

Suggested Remedy
Clarify the text in section 8.4.10.3.1 and in table 353a, type 185 ('Tx power report').

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Lack of specific text.

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **4379**   **Comment submitted by:** Brian   Kiernan   Member   2005/04/28

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 573   **Starting Line #** 1   **Fig/Table#**   **Section** 12

I object to the resolution of comments #3520 and #3521, both of which dealt with system profiles.

Without adoption of definitive system profiles 802.16e cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called a standard. It can't even be called a "cookbook". In reality it is more like a shopping list from which anybody can pick any combination of non-interoperable ingredients.

Definitive system profiles are absolutely required.   Despite the shortcomings identified as the reason for their rejection, the system profiles proposed during the last recirc were at least a starting point in defining an interoperable set of parameters.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution C80216e-05_60r2 or any subsequent updates or revisions to it.

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 4353.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16e/D7   **Ballot Number:** 0001037   Comment Date

Comment # 4384   **Comment submitted by:** Jonathan   Labs   Member   2005/04/28

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 999   **Starting Line #** 1   **Fig/Table#**   **Section**

I object to the resolutions of comments 3034, 3233, 3269, 3474 and 3480 in IEEE 802.16-05/019 (or database IEEE 802.16-05/12r3). All these comments address the usage of SS versus MS versus FSS. The resolution of the group was: "Change all SS to MS in 802.16e draft for new text or modified text; do not change SS in unmodified/duplicated instances. Delete the definition of FS".

I feel this is a quick and not very careful attempt at solving a major problem with the ammendment. Here is just one example where this solution does not solve the problem: Look at page 52, line 19, section 6.3.2.3.23 which is titled in 802.16-2004 "SS Basic Capability Request (SBC-REQ) message", but is now titled in 16e/D7 as "MS basic capability request (SBC-REQ) message". To me this is telling me that with the changes from the amendment, SBC-REQ are now only defined for MS and not fixed SS.

I think it gets worse if one looks at the text changes in 6.3.2.3.26 De/Re-register command (DREG-CMD) message, specifically at Table 55--Action codes and actions. All action codes are now defined for MSs, not SSs. This tells me that there are now no action codes for a fixed SS.

In my mind an SS can be either a mobile SS or a fixed SS. MS is only a mobile SS.

These are just a few examples of the problem. There are many others. I provided an extensive list of modifications in the last ballot to clean this problem up, but I do not believe they were considered by the Ballot resolution committee. I will not provide "specific text" again, only to have it ignored.

This problem will slap you in the face when this ammendment is eventually integrated with 802.16-2004 to form a new revision.

Suggested Remedy
Fix up the usage of MS versus SS, such that the text does not break the operation of fixed systems. I would recommend reviewing again comments 3034, 3233, 3269, 3474 and 3480 in IEEE 802.16-05/019 as a starting guide.

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
Lack of specific text.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D7**   **Ballot Number:** **0001037**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **4387**   **Comment submitted by:** Remi   Chayer   Member   2005/04/28

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

I object to the resolution of Comment 3250 in 80216-05_12r3 (which was related to comments #1850, #1859, #1861 and #1864 in 80216-05_010). It is important to include complete profiles in the document. Contribution C80216e-05_60r2 was a start.

Suggested Remedy

The working group should start developing complete profiles based on the input from the participants.

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See 4353

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items