P802.16k to Sponsor Ballot: Conditional Approval

21 July 2006

Rules

Motions requesting conditional approval to forward where the prior ballot has closed shall be accompanied by:

- Date the ballot closed
- Vote tally including Approve, Disapprove and Abstain votes
- Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and Working Group responses.
- Schedule for confirmation ballot and resolution meeting.

Date the ballot closed:
9 July 2006

Stage	Open	Close
Initial WG Ballot	9 June	**9 July 2006**

Vote tally including Approve, Disapprove and Abstain votes

• 102	Approve	96%
• 4	Disapprove	
• 34	Abstain	
	Return	61%

Comment resolution

- 27 comments received and resolved
  - 17 Accepted or Accepted-Modified
  - 5 Rejected
  - 5 Withdrawn
- Technical Disapprove: 8
  - 4 Satisfied
  - 4 not yet Satisfied
    - None specifically unsatisfied
    - From three voters

Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and Working Group responses

- attached

Schedule for confirmation ballot and resolution meeting

- July 19 Completed D2
- July 22: Issue D2
- July 28: Open First Recirculation
- Aug 13: Close First Recirculation
- Sept 25-28: comment resolution at 802.16 Session #45, if necessary

802.16 WG Motion

802.16 Closing Plenary: 20 July 2006:

Motion: To authorize the WG chair to request conditional approval to forward the 802.16g and 802.16k drafts for Sponsor Ballot.

- Proposed: Phillip Barber
- Seconded: Panyuh Joo
- Approved 47-0-0.

Motion

To grant conditional approval, under Clause 20, to forward P802.16k for Sponsor Ballot.

Moved: Marks

Seconded:

Approve:

Disapprove:

Abstain:

Document under Review: IEEE P802.16k/D1 **Ballot Number:** 22 **Comme**

Comment # 002 **Comment submitted by:** Avi Freedman Member 2006-07

Comment Type Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 1 **Starting Line #** 2 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

What document does this amendment refer to? There is a mismatch between the section numbers in this document and the original IEEE 802.1D-2004 document, as found on 802 IEEE official disc.
For example: there is no section 6.5.5, as stated in the editing instructions of this document.

Suggested Remedy

State the correct document and relevant amendments

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

This 802.16k Amendment Project is amending the 802.1D-2004 document as amended by 802.17a. It is the common, expected, and required practice of the 802 community of standards to write amendments demonstrating method for conformance to the 802.1D bridging standard. The 802.1 Working Group requires that the other 802 Working Groups author these amendments themselves, as the appropriate technology specific experts. If you observe the changes in 802.17a, the numbers do not mismatch.

Vote:
In Favor: 0 Against: 10 Abstain: 2
Comment Reiected

Document under Review: IEEE P802.16k/D1 **Ballot Number:** 22 **Comme**

Comment # 026L **Comment submitted by:** David Johnston Member 2006-07

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied **Starting Page #** 999 **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section** 6.5.5

The encoding of both the user_priority and access_priority in the ISSP is redundant, since both with be equal, resulting from the 1:1 mapping of user_priority to access_priority a described in 802.1D.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt the changes in S802.16k-06/002

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

Adopt the changes in S802.16k-06/002

Reason for Recommendation

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

Adopt the changes in S802.16g-06_043.ppt

Accepted without opposition

Document under Review: IEEE P802.16k/D1 **Ballot Number:** 22 **Comme**

Comment # 003 **Comment submitted by:** Paul Piggin Member 2006-07

Comment Type Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 2 **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section** 6.5.5

The language in section 6.5.5 is not strictly appropriate for a standard. It is of a style which is introductory in nature and thereby interrupts the document's flow. Reference to 'that standard' in the first paragraph is inappropriate text for an amendment.

Suggested Remedy

Rephase section 6.5.5 and any other sections to ensure the amendment fits seamlessly with the base document.

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

The langauge proposed by this amendment for subclause 6.5.5 is consistent with the language used in the prior technology specific bridging conformance subclauses in 802.1D (see 6.5.4). Specifically, in the -2004 document, page 23, paragraph 2, the sentence uses the language 'Clause 7 of that standard....'

Vote:
In Favor: 0 Against: 8 Abstain: 4
Comment Reiected

Document under Review: IEEE P802.16k/D1 **Ballot Number:** 22 **Comme**

Comment # 001 **Comment submitted by:** Richard van Leeuwen Member 2006-07

Comment Type Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 0 **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section**

"Abstract: This amendment specifies protocols and procedures to support the bridging of IEEE 802.16 frames over 802.1D MAC Bridges."

Actually, it should provide the necessary information to IEEE Std. 802.1D to map the ISS to the IEEE 802.16 CS service parameters as described in section 6.5 of 802.1D:
"This subclause specifies the mapping of the Internal Sublayer Service to the MAC Protocol and Procedures of each individual IEEE 802 MAC type, and the encoding of the parameters of the

Suggested Remedy

Update the abstract

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

On the cover page, for the 'Abstract', modify the text as:
'Abstract: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.1D defines support of the internal sublayer service by the IEEE 802.16 MAC.'

Accepted without opposition

Document under Review: IEEE P802.16k/D1 **Ballot Number:** 22 **Comme**

Comment # 023 **Comment submitted by:** Richard van Leeuwen Member 2006-07

Comment Type Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 999 **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section** 6.5.5.2.1.1

In the second paragraph it is not clear whether "least significant bit" refers to the least significant bit of the ISSP byte, or of the three priority bits?.

Suggested Remedy

Describe the bit positions in the ISSP byte as well as significance.

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

Reason for Recommendation

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

see resolution of comment 026L

Accepted without opposition