Project	IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group		
Title	Call for Comments on Coexistence Document IEEE 802.16.2-00/01r6		
Date Submitted	2000-06-29		
Source	Leland Langston Crosspan 17217 Waterview, Dallas, TX 75082	Voice: Fax: E-mail:	972-344-0795 972-344-0759 j-langston2@raytheon.com
Re:	IEEE 802.16.2-00/01r6: Draft Recommended Practice for Coexistence of Broadband Wireless Access Systems		
Abstract	This document is a call for comments on the current draft of the Coexistence Practice document. The call is for comments of a specific nature and responses to this call should address only the areas delineated within this document. Responses of a general nature will not be accepted.		
Purpose	Comments on the current version of the Coexistence Practice will be used to refine the content of the document. These comments will also be used to judge the level of support for the document content. **Due Date: 7 July 2000**		
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.16. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.		
Release	The contributor acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made publicly available by 802.16.		

Call for Comments on

Draft Recommended Practice for Coexistence of Broadband Wireless Access Systems, IEEE 802.16.2-00/01r6

Leland Langston
Crosspan

Introduction

This call for comments is intended to give the 802.16 Working Group an opportunity to provide comments and suggestions for improving the content of the coexistence practice. The document is still being developed, but it has reached a level of maturity that gives the reader a reasonable view of specific recommendations. Comments will be used to fine-tune the document.

Scope

The comments being solicited are specific in nature. All comments should address only the specific area for which comments are being solicited. Comments should follow the paragraph ordering within the call. Except where specifically requested, essay responses are not permitted.

Call

All comments should be made using this call as a template and inserting your recommendation in the spaces provided. Although brevity is important, you may use addition space if necessary when commenting on a particular section.

Overall Document

This is the only area where comments of a general nature can be made, but they should be brief and address a major concern or shortcoming of the document.

1. I feel that the document will provide a workable means for achieving coexistence between broadband wireless systems which share the *same frequency*, but are located in different, although possibly adjacent, geographic areas.

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, then provide a response to the following:

   My concern is:

   My recommendation is:

2. I feel that the document will provide a workable means for achieving coexistence between broadband wireless systems which share the *same geographic* area, but use different, although possibly adjacent, frequency blocks:

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, then provide a response to the following:

   My concern is:

   My recommendation is:

3. Regarding the Co-Ordination Process described in Section 7 of the document, I feel that the recommended process is both an adequate and an acceptable means for coordinating between license holders which may share the same frequency but be located in adjacent geographic areas:

   Yes [ ] NO [ ]

   {**Note**: Comments here should be limited to the process and should not address the numerical parameters contained within the section; an opportunity for comments regarding specific numerical values is provided later.}

   If no, then provide a response to the following:

   My concern is:

   My recommendation is:

4. In addition to providing specific recommendation for coexistence parameters in Section 7 (e.g., psfd limits) that facilitate coexistence, the document also contains in Section 6 equipment recommendations that may assist the operator in minimizing both his susceptibility to interference and his contribution to interference.

   I feel that the information contained in Section 6 is both reasonable and sufficient as a means to help the operator achieve coexistence objectives:

YES [ ] No [ ]

If no, then provide a response to the following:

My concern is:

My recommendation is:

Specific Paragraphs and Parameters

This section is limited to comments only on specific parameters.

1. Paragraph 6.1.1.1, Base Transceiver Station Maximum EIRP limit: 14 dBW/MHz

   I agree:

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, my recommendation is: _____ dBW/MHz
   My rationale is:

2. Paragraph 6.1.1.2, Subscriber Transceiver Station Maximum EIRP Limit: 30 dBW/MHz
   (Note: *This is the maximum under rain faded conditions. Also see 6.1.2.1 below)*

   I agree:

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, my recommendation is: _____ dBW/MHz
   My rationale is:

3. Paragraph 6.1.2.1, STS Upstream Power Control Power Limits. When upstream power control is employed, the maximum EIRP limit is as given in 6.1.1.2. Without power control, the limit is: 15 dBW/MHz

   I agree:

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, my recommendation is: _____ dBW/MHz
   My rationale is:

4. Paragraph 6.1.3, Frequency Tolerance of Stability: +/- 10 ppm

   I agree:

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, my recommendation is: _____ ppm
   My rationale is:

5. Paragraph 6.1.4.1, Unwanted Emissions Limit (See page 23 of document)

   I agree:

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, my recommendation is:
   (Specify specific numeric values, mask or equation.)
   My rationale is:

6. Paragraph 6.1.5.3, BTS Antenna Radiation Pattern Envelope

   This section contains three azimuth RPE masks for BTS antennas and three elevation RPE masks for BTS antennas. The mask are adequate and acceptable.

   I agree:

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, my recommendation is:
   (Specify specific numeric values, mask or equation.)
   My rationale is:

7. Paragraph 6.1.5.4, STS Antenna Radiation Pattern Envelope

   This section contains three RPE masks for STS antennas. The masks are adequate and acceptable.

   I agree:

   YES [ ] NO [ ]

   If no, my recommendation is:
   (Specify specific numeric values, mask or equation.)
   My rationale is:

8. Paragraph 6.2.1.1, Base Transceiver Station Co-channel Interference Tolerance

This paragraph states that systems deployed by an operator should be designed to tolerate a minimum amount of interference from other systems. The minimum receiver sensitivity degradation expected due to interference per system is: 1 dB

I agree:

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If no, my recommendation is: ____ dB
Rationale:

9. Paragraph 6.2.1.2, Subscriber Transceiver Station Co-channel Interference Tolerance

This paragraph states that systems deployed by an operator should be designed to tolerate a minimum amount of interference from other systems. The minimum receiver sensitivity degradation expected due to interference per system is: 1 dB

I agree:

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If no, my recommendation is: ____ dB
Rationale:

10. Paragraph 6.2.2.1, Base Transceiver Station Adjacent Channel Interference Tolerance

This paragraph states that systems deployed by an operator should be designed to tolerate a minimum amount of interference from other systems. The minimum C/I_{adj} expected is: 0 dB

I agree:

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If no, my recommendation is: ____ dB
Rationale:

11. Paragraph 6.2.2.2, Subscriber Transceiver Station Adjacent Channel Interference Tolerance

This paragraph states that systems deployed by an operator should be designed to tolerate a minimum amount of interference from other systems. The minimum C/I_{adj} expected is: 0 dB

I agree:

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If no, my recommendation is: ____ dB
Rationale:

12. Paragraph 6.2.3.1, Base Transceiver Station CW Interference Tolerance

This paragraph states that systems deployed by an operator should be designed to tolerate a minimum amount of CW interference from other systems. (For the specific recommendations, refer to this paragraph in the practice document.)
The maximum degradation in receiver sensitivity is: 1 dB
for a CW interference level of: 30 dBc
for frequencies greater than 250% BW

I agree:

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If no, my recommendation is: ____ dB
_____ dBc
_____ %BW

Rationale

13. Paragraph 6.2.3.2, Subscriber Transceiver Station CW Interference Tolerance

This paragraph states that systems deployed by an operator should be designed to tolerate a minimum amount of CW interference from other systems. (For the specific recommendations, refer to this paragraph in the practice document.)
The maximum degradation in receiver sensitivity is: 1 dB
for a CW interference level of: 30 dBc
for frequencies greater than : 500% BW

I agree:

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If no, my recommendation is: ____ dB
_____ dBc
_____ %BW

Rationale:

14. Paragraph 7.1, Table 2: Recommended psfd Trigger Limits (see table):

I agree:

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If no, my recommendation is: (Insert your table of recommended values)
Rationale:

Summary

This call for comments is intended to provide the members of 802.16 an opportunity to review and comment on key parameters being incorporated into the coexistence practice document. Although the document is still being developed, much of the structure is in place and key parameters have been inserted. While the coexistence task group believes that the parameters currently contained in the document are reasonable, results from simulations to date have shown that there are some inconsistencies. However, the coexistence task group believes that comments on the selected portions of the document will be helpful in finalizing the draft document, even if final tweaks are made as a result of further simulations.