Document under Review: **P802.16/Conf04/D6**   **Ballot Number:**   **Comment Date**

Comment # **1**   **Comment submitted by:**   CAI, SEAN S

Comment   **Type** Technical, Satisfied (was   **Starting Page #** 86   **Starting Line #** 5   **Fig/Table#**   **Section** A.5.6

The allowed ranges of BS/SS Timers should at least give out either minumum or maximum values to enable TSS-TP (Test doc) to use the values for testing purposes.

Suggested Remedy

In the "Allowed range" colummn of Table A.181, 1) all "<" should be replaced with "<=" or an equivalent symbol, 2) all ">" should be replaced with ">=" or an equivalent symbol.

In the "Allowed range" colummn of Table A.183, 1) all "<" should be replaced with "<=" or an equivalent symbol, 2) all ">" should be replaced with ">=" or an equivalent symbol.

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

Part of Disapprove Vote: Yes

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Agree**

Table A.181
Replace all occurances of "<" with "<="
Replace all occurances of ">" with ">="
Fix item numbering so it starts with "1"

Table A.183
Replace all occurances of "<" with "<="
Replace all occurances of ">" with ">="
Fix item numbering so it starts with "1"

Additions made during IEEE 802.16 Session #43 in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006
From: "Sean Cai"
To: "'herbert ruck'"
Cc: <r.b.marks@ieee.org>, "'Gordon Antonello'"
Subject: RE: We have resolved your comment
Date: Thu, 9 Mar 2006 21:57:41 -0800

Date: Thu, 9 Mar 2006 21:07:41 -0800

Roger,

I am satisfied with the resolution. I would like to change Disapprove status to Approve.

Regards,
Sean Cai

From: herbert ruck
Sent: Thursday, March 09, 2065

Subject: We have resolved your comment
Dear Sean,
The TGC has accepted your comment on the equal or greater limits for
the timer values and the change will be implemented in D7. The details
are in the uploaded database. We would appreciate if you would change
your NO vote to YES and if you could confirm the change with an e-mail
to Roger, Gordon and me. Thank you an best regard
Herbert Ruck

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

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

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16/Conf04/D6**   Ballot Number: Comment Date

Comment # **7**   Comment submitted by: ULLMANN, RAINER T

Comment   Type **Editorial, Satisfied**   Starting Page # **25**   Starting Line # **6**   Fig/Table#   Section

The tables A.28 and A.72 indicate that all 4 QoS services of 802.16-2004 are supported. However, section 12.4.2.1 Baisc Packet PMP profile (OFDMA_ProfM1) only requires support of BE and nrtPS. rtPS and UGS not required and hence optional only. This is true for both SS and BS. PICS and should be corrected for both.

E-mail of May 3, 2006:
From: Rainer Ullmann [rullmann@wavesat.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2006 8:20 AM
To: herbert ruck
Cc: rullmann@wavesat.com; r.b.marks@IEEE.ORG
Subject: RE: Comment #07 on services in the 802.16c-Conformance04 standard

Dear Herbert,

I apologize that I wasn't able to participate in the recent recirculation process due to business travel and personal absence.

I also had an off site meeting yesterday because of which I missed both your phone calls. Anyhow, you recalled our conversation in Denver absolutely correct – but here it is in writing:

My preferred solution for #7 is:

Section p.24, line 17 (section A.5.2.3.2.4 Uplink scheduling services, Table A.28)

Below the table add sentence:

At least one of the above scheduling services must be supported.

Section p.44, line 17, (section A.5.3.3.2.4 Uplink scheduling services, Table A.72)

Below the table add sentence:

At least one of the above scheduling services must be supported

The above line numbers, etc refer to IEEE P802.16/Conformance04/D7.

NOTE:

I am not sure whether this is possible at this point but I would like to officially change my vote from "Disapprove" to "Approve", with comment #7 remaining as "Editorial" only. This reflects that the changes that were already implemented in D7 (i.e all service types optional) were satisfying even if not

absolutely complete w.r.t. to our discussion about this issue. I hope this resolves your problem in bringing this project to a closing. If not please feel free to contact me again to instruct me how to do so. I will not be attending the Tel Aviv meeting and therefore would like to thank you at this point for doing this thorough job - Good work !

Best regards,

Rainer
Rainer Ullmann, Ph.D

Suggested Remedy

Change in table A.28 status for item 1 and 2 from "m" to "o". Change in table A.72 status for item 1 and 2 from "m" to "o"

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Recommendation by**

Part of Disapprove Vote: Yes

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Principle**

Page 25, line 6
Table A.28 items 1-4
Change Status from "m" to "o"

Additions made during the IEEE 802.16e meeting in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006
1) Change Type "Technical" to "Editorial"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Additions made during IEEE 802.16 Session #43 in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006

After reviewing the e-mail of May 3rd, the ballot resolution committee reaffirms the decision from IEEE 802.16 Session #42, namely that

the 802.16-2004 standard does not explicitly mandate the support of the services and they are therefore listed as optional in the PICS. Adding the note requested in the e-mail would be equivalent to adding normative text that again is not supported by the standard. The decision is therefore to leave the text as is in P802.16/Conformance04_D7 that was recirculated after the sponsor ballot.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

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

Applied the same resolution to Table A.72 as required by the comment.
Table A.72 refers to the BS capabilities and there is a symmetry between the
capabilities of the MS and BS thus the entries in tables A.28 (for MS) and A.72 (for BS)
should be the same.

Additions made during the IEEE 802.16e meeting in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006
Changed Type from "Technical" to "Editorial"

Editor's Questions and Concerns

The comment author suggested in a personal discussion to make it
mandatory to implement at least one service.

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16/Conf04/D6**   Ballot Number: Comment Date

Comment # 8   **Comment submitted by:**   ULLMANN, RAINER T

Comment   Type Technical, Satisfied (was   **Starting Page #** 86   **Starting Line #** 32   Fig/Table#   Section

T19 (item 13) has a "?" for the allowed range. the corresponfding table 342 in 802.16-2004 shows no value. I guess anything would pass the "?" requirement - or would nothing pass? P802.16_Cor1/D5 removes this entry completely from the global paramter table....

Suggested Remedy

Remove item 13 (T19) from Table 181

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: Recommendation by

Part of Disapprove Vote: Yes

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Agree**

Page 86, line 32 Table A.181
Remove item 13

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Addition made following IEEE 802.16 Session #43 in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006
From: "Rainer Ullmann"
To: "'herbert ruck'"
Cc: <r.b.marks@ieee.org>
Subject: RE: Comment #07 on services in the 802.16c-Conformance04 standard
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 09:19:37 -0400

Dear Herbert,

I apologize that I wasn't able to participate in the recent recirculation process due to business travel and personal absence.
I also had an off site meeting yesterday because of which I missed both your phone calls. Anyhow, you recalled our conversation in Denver absolutely correct – but here it is in writing:

My preferred solution for #7 is:

Section p.24, line 17 (section A.5.2.3.2.4 Uplink scheduling services, Table A.28)
Below the table add sentence:
At least one of the above scheduling services must be supported.

Section p.44, line 17, (section A.5.3.3.2.4 Uplink scheduling services, Table A.72)
Below the table add sentence:
At least one of the above scheduling services must be supported

The above line numbers, etc refer to IEEE P802.16/Conformance04/D7.

NOTE:
I am not sure whether this is possible at this point but I would like to officially change my vote from "Disapprove" to "Approve", with
comment #7 remaining as "Editorial" only. This reflects that the changes that were already implemented in D7 (i.e all service types optional) were satisfying even if not
absolutely complete w.r.t. to our discussion about this issue. I hope this resolves your problem in bringing this project to a closing. If not please feel free to contact me again
to instruct me how to do so. I will not be attending the Tel Aviv meeting and therefore would like to thank you at this point for doing this thorough job - Good work !

Best regards,

Rainer

Rainer Ullmann, Ph.D
Product Line Manager
Wavesat Inc.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

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

Also, renumbered table after removing item 13

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items