

2001/08/03

IEEE 802.16-01/42

Document under Review: **P802.16/D4-2001**

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **1**

Comment submitted by: Moshe Ran

#3b

Member

2001/08/01

Change Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **284**

Starting Line # **31**

Section **8.2.6**

Add additional channelization options, symbol rate, roll-off factor and frame duration. The current table address only 20, 25, and 28 MHz channels. (see also commnet 288)

Reason

To be compliant with 802.16ab also 10, 20 and optionally 5 MHz should be addressed. The Channel bandwidth for 10.5 Ghz 3.5, 5 and 7 MHz according to EN 301 021 and CEPT/WRC Rec. 12-05 E MUST be supported since they are in the specs of this standard. Note that M20 requirement from the FRD document : 802.16.1 SHALL NOT preclude the ability of an 802.16.1 system to deliver less than 2 Mbps peak-per-user capacity.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[Resolution by Working Group Chair]: This comment duplicates Comment 288 {see "Group's Notes"} of Recirculation Ballot #3a, without providing new technical issues. Considering the comment in detail:

*"To be compliant with 802.16ab also 10, 20 and optionally 5 MHz should be addressed."
-This argument is outside the scope of the ballot. P802.16a and P802.16b are being developed as amendments to the draft under consideration, with independent PHYs. The channelization in P802.16 and P802.16b is unrelated to the channelization defined here.

*"The Channel bandwidth for 10.5 Ghz 3.5, 5 and 7 MHz according to EN 301 021 and CEPT/WRC Rec. 12-05 E MUST be supported since they are in the specs of this standard."
-The argument is that the standard must support narrower channels because it covers 10-66 GHz and some administrations allocate narrow bands at 10.5 GHz. This point adds nothing to the issue presented by Comment 288. [The group resolution was that the standard is applicable down to 10 GHz *provided* that a spectrum allocation is available; it is not applicable to arbitrary spectrum allocations between 10 and 66 GHz.]

*"Note that M20 requirement from the FRD document : 802.16.1 SHALL NOT preclude the ability of an 802.16.1 system to deliver less than 2 Mbps peak-per-user capacity."

-Without stating so directly, this sentence implies that the draft violates an aspect of the FRD. However, it provides no justification for that implication. [Furthermore, the Chair sees no inconsistency whatsoever with that aspect of the FRD, noting, for example, that the draft supports a 32 Mbit/s channel shared by multiple users.] In any case, the Functional Requirements Document (IEEE 802.16s-99/00r1, 1999-12-17) is an outline of anticipated requirements and is not binding on a future balloting group.

Group's Notes

Comment 288 from Recirculation Ballot #3a

Change

Add additional channelization options to address 10.5 GHz applications. 7 MHz and 3.5 MHz should be included as they are frequently used by products already operating in this frequency band.

Reason

Channel sizes of 20 MHz and greater are not viable for typical frequency allocations at 10.5 GHz, where the overall 150 MHz band is sub-divided for use among many different operators-typically in tranches of 30 MHz. Since the standard is supposed to address applications from 10-66 GHz, at least one of the mandatory channelizations should be suitable for 10.5 GHz applications. The specific channelizations and baud rates were submitted as comments to letter ballot #3.

Decision of Group

Rejected

Resolution of Group

The fact that the 802.16 (TG1) standard addresses 10-66 GHz does not mean that ANY spectrum opportunity could be used for LMDS-like services (i.e., 20 MHz vs. 500 MHz). The example given by the comment is more suitable for the 802.16a (TG3) case which addresses such spectrum opportunities in a better way. The fact that 10 GHz is a lower limit to 802.16 (TG1) is more of propagation aspects and suitability of the PHY.

Furthermore, please note the actual language of section 8.2.6 : "...other combinations of channel size, symbol rate, roll-off factor, and frame duration could be made, but interoperability will not be guaranteed in these cases."

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2001/08/03

IEEE 802.16-01/42

Document under Review: **P802.16/D4-2001**

Ballot Number: **3 a**

Comment Date

Comment # **2**

Comment submitted by: Yigal

Leiba

Member

2001/08/02

Change Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **106**

Starting Line # **6**

Section **6.2.2.3.27**

Change the comparison value field width to 32bits

Reason

Allow more flexibility in the times of sending the CLK-CMP message, and reduce the need to compensate for the 8-bit field overflow (that would happen because of the difference between clock frequencies).

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[Resolution by Working Group Chair]: The Clock Comparison Value in P802.16/D4-2001 is identical to that in P802.16/D3-2001. Therefore, the comment is out of scope of this ballot.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items