

Comments received on proposed 802.16j PAR

Roger Marks (2006-03-02)

*Proposed Editorial Update to 802.16j PAR Proposal (Roger B. Marks; 2006-03-02)
IEEE C802.16mmr-06/016*

→ Adopted as a baseline document for our PAR modification.

*Proposed Changes to Draft 802.16j PAR (Roger B. Marks; 2006-03-02)
IEEE C802.16mmr-06/017*

It was agreed by the study group to change the title of the document to be "Amendment to IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks – Part 16: Air Interface for Fixed and Mobile Broadband Wireless Access Systems – Multihop Relay Specification"

It was agreed by the study group to change the purpose of the document to be "To enhance coverage , throughput and system capacity of 802.16 networks by specifying 802.16 multihop relay capabilities and functionalities of interoperable relay stations and base stations."

Matthew Sherman (2006-03-07)

*Please accept the attached contribution as comments on the MMR PAR.
IEEE C802.16mmr-06/019*

In Clause 15 replace 'will be considerably less' with 'can be considerably less' (this comment withdrawn)

The contribution was discussed and the study group does not believe changes would improve the content.

In Clause 21 replace 'the base station' with 'a base station.'

In Clause 21 add 'Control functions can be centralized at the base station or some control functions can be distributed among the relay stations with central coordination from a base station.'

The study group agreed to replace Clause 21 with "Item 13. Control functions may be centralized at the base station or distributed among the relay stations with central coordination from the base station."

802.19 TAG (2006-03-07)

In reviewing the 802.16j PAR in the TAG meeting we identified several concerns regarding the 802.16j PAR.

1. In Item 6 of the PAR selects both "New Document" and "Amendment to and Existing Document." I don't think it can be both.

We appreciate the comment. We agree and have corrected the answer to "No."

2. In Item 12h of the PAR selects both "Yes" and "No" while I don't think this is an extension to a previous PAR.

We appreciate the comment. We agree and have corrected the answer to "No."

Patrick Kinney (2006-03-07)

I have the following issues:

12h: both the yes and no boxes are checked, is it yes or no?

We appreciate the comment. We agree and have corrected the answer to "No."

17 it is indicated that there is another document or project with a similar scope which requires an explanation. No explanation is provided.

We appreciate the comment. We agree and have corrected the answer to "No." We do not see any projects with similar scope.

2006-03-07

IEEE 802.16mmr-06/007r1

Finally it has been shown that the 802.16 signal is extremely vulnerable to any interference such as UWB or even thermal noise. I do not believe that we should encourage deployment of this standard until this deficiency is repaired.

We disagree with the (unsupported) premise of the comment. In any case, we do not see any implication of the comment with regard to the PAR and Five Criteria.

Darwin Engwer (2006-03-07)

Clause 17 of the 802.16j PAR acknowledges that there are other documents/ projects with a similar scope, but does not provide the required details.

We appreciate the comment. We agree and have corrected the answer to "No." We do not see any projects with similar scope.

Recognizing that 802.16j does NOT intend to create a full mesh topology there are still aspects of 802.16j that are "mesh-like" and hence warrant collaboration with 802.11s and 802.15.5.

These aspects include but are not limited to relay station discovery, path selection and relayed access control/ authentication.

We are happy to coordinate with 802.11s and 802.15.5 on an ongoing basis.

If 802.16j intends to limit itself to a single hop perhaps 802.16 should consider changing the task group name from "Mobile Multihop Relay" (MMR) to something more appropriate, and also change the text in the actual PAR to reflect the single hop nature of the amendment.

We do not intend to limit relaying to a single hop.

Avi (2006-03-06)

In the proposed PAR you checked YES under item :

17. ARE THERE OTHER DOCUMENTS OR PROJECTS WITH A SIMILAR SCOPE?

without indicating which document/project actually have the same scope. Is it an error? (I personally don't know of such documents/projects)

We appreciate the comment. We agree and have corrected the answer to "No." We do not see any projects with similar scope.

Wern Ho Sheen (2006-03-07)

Enclosed please find the slide of "Recommendations on the PAR and Five Criteria for Mobile Multihop Relay Task Group", which includes several minor revisions on the draft PAR and five criteria. Maybe we could make a quick discussion on this in tomorrow SG meeting to make the content be more consistent with the general agreement in MMR SG. Thank you.

IEEE C802.16mmr-06/021

The contribution was discussed and the study group does not believe changes would improve the content.