

Project	IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group < http://ieee802.org/16 >	
Title	Editorial Comments on P802.16.2/D2-2001 in Recirculation Ballot	
Date Submitted	2001-04-26	
Source(s)	Roger Marks NIST 325 Broadway Boulder, CO 80305	Voice: +1-303-497-3037 Fax: +1-303-497-3037 mailto:r.b.marks@ieee.org
Re:	IEEE Sponsor Recirculation Ballot of P802.16.2/D2-2001	
Abstract	This is a compound editorial comment to be submitted in the Sponsor Recirculation Ballot of P802.16.2/D2-2001.	
Purpose	This document is intended to editorially improve P802.16.2/D2-2001	
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 grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.16.	
Patent Policy and Procedures	The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy and Procedures (Version 1.0) < http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html >, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, if there is technical justification in the opinion of the standards-developing committee and provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder that it will license applicants under reasonable terms and conditions for the purpose of implementing the standard." Early disclosure to the Working Group of patent information that might be relevant to the standard is essential to reduce the possibility for delays in the development process and increase the likelihood that the draft publication will be approved for publication. Please notify the Chair < mailto:r.b.marks@ieee.org > as early as possible, in written or electronic form, of any patents (granted or under application) that may cover technology that is under consideration by or has been approved by IEEE 802.16. The Chair will disclose this notification via the IEEE 802.16 web site < http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices >.	

The following page, line, and figure number refer to P802.16.2/D2-2001:

R01:

*Page 12, Lines 1-3: Replace the sentence with: “This document is not intended to be a replacement for applicable regulations, which would take precedence.” This change is to supersede changes under consideration in this recirculation. It is intended to simplify and clarify the wording.

R02:

*Page 15, Line 33: subscript the “o” in “Bo”

R03:

*Page 13, Lines 9-10: change definition to “Wireless access in which the connection(s) capabilities are broadband.” This change is to supersede changes under consideration in this recirculation.

Reasons:

(a) The definition should refer to existing definition of “wireless access” so that the two are fully consistent.

(b) Consistency with ITU-R F.1399. The definition there is “Wireless access in which the connection(s) capabilities are higher than the primary rate.” However, P802.16.2 doesn’t define “primary rate”, so it would be better to make use of its definition of “broadband”.

R04:

*Page 13, Lines 36-38: change definition to “A contiguous portion of spectrum within a sub-band or frequency band, typically assigned to a single operator. NOTE - A collection of frequency blocks may form a sub-band and/or a frequency band.” This change is to supersede changes under consideration in this recirculation.

Reason:

(a) This makes the definition identical to that of ITU-R F.1399.

(b) One key difference is the word “contiguous”. The definitions are very different when the authorized band includes noncontiguous spectrum, as it often does in BWA. It seems that the draft generally seems to be thinking of the ITU-R definition.

R05:

Figure 3: Fix the unintelligible screen version so that it looks like the printed version.

R06:

Figure 4: the word “Victim” should be moved so that it’s clearly attached to the nearest arrow

R07: Figure 6: change “Hub” to “SS”

R08: Figure 8: subscript the “o” in “Bo” (six places); move the large double-headed arrow so it doesn’t lie on top of the “1”; add space between number and “dBW” (five places)

R09: Figures 11-18: delete title inside figure frame (this is redundant with caption)

R10: Figures 11-18: change “dBrel” to “pdf relative to 0° (dB)”; make same change in Tables 3-10

R11: Figures 11-18: change “deg.” to “degrees”

R12: Figures 11-20: delete frame around figure

R13: Figure 19: delete title inside figure frame; delete legend (the box showing the symbol for “Availability”); add to end of caption the words “ R=3.6 km”); put “%” in parenthesis in vertical axis label; put “dB” in parentheses in horizontal axis label; delete hyphen before “dB” in horizontal axis label

R14: Figure 20: delete title inside figure frame; delete legend (the box showing the symbol for “Series 1”); add to end of caption the words “ of 99.995%”); put “km” in parenthesis in vertical axis label; put “dB” in parentheses in horizontal axis label; delete hyphen before “km” in vertical axis label

R15: Figure 22: delete Figure 22; change final sentence of 8.1.5 from “Figure 21 provides an example.” to “Figure C.5 provides an example.”; [If this is not acceptable, then: label the axes; delete legend (the box showing the symbol for “Series 1”); delete frame around figure.]

R16: Figure A.1: move the arrows on “Min Sep’n” to clarify what they are pointing to; change “Min Sep’n” to “Minimum Separation”

R17: Figure C.1: subscript the “i” in “Ri”

R18: Figure C.2: subscript the “rc” in “Drc” and the “c” in “Rc”

R19: Figure C.3: subscript the “c” in “Rc”

R20: Figure C.7: change “Atm= 0.21 dB/km” to “Attenuation = 0.21 dB/km”

R21: Figure C.7: delete “O” below upper square

R22: Figure C.8: change “Locus ofx 60 km psfd Test Probe” to “Locus of 60 km psfd Test Probe”; change “LMDS Deployment” to “Deployment” (two places); change “sq km” to “km²” [where the ‘2’ is superscripted]

R23: Fig C.9: change “rx” to “Rx”; change “tx” to “Tx”; change “sub” to “subscriber”

R24: Figure D.1: change “Pfd” to “pdf” (5 places); add space in “30days”

R25: Figure F.1: change “Pfd” to “pdf” in note

R26: Change first sentence of Recommendation 8 from “Utilize antennas for the base station and subscriber stations at least as good as shown in 6.2.” to “Utilize antennas for the base station and subscriber stations at least as good as the Class 1 antennas described in 6.2.”

Reason: to clarify that it is the Class 1 antennas that this sentence refers to.

R27: Change the first two paragraphs of 6.2.2.1 from “The performance of BS antennas is divided into two electrical classes. Depending on the deployment environment, the specific antenna class may be chosen to provide suitable coverage. The distinguishing factor between the classes is the severity of interference into other transceivers. Although it is outside the scope of this document to address intra-system interference, selection of antennas may be principally determined by interference arising from within an operator's own network rather than from external sources.” to:

“The performance of BS antennas is here divided into two electrical classes. Class 1 represents the minimum recommended performance. Class 2 antennas have enhanced RPEs and represent more favorable coexistence performance.”

Reason: To distinguish the two classes by stating the Class 1 is recommended.

R28: Change introduction to 6.2.3 (“Fixed BWA systems employ SS antennas that are highly directional, narrow-beam antennas. Although it is not as important for coexistence as the BS RPE, the RPE of the SS antenna is a factor in determining inter-system interference.”) by adding a second paragraph:

“The performance of SS antennas is here divided into three electrical classes. Class 1 is defined with moderate sidelobe characteristics and represents the minimum recommended performance. Class 2 and Class 3 antennas have enhanced RPEs and represent increasingly favorable coexistence performance.”

Reason: To introduce the concepts of antenna classes on the SS side, and to distinguish the classes by stating the Class 1 is recommended.

R29: From this sentence in 6.2.2.1.1: “Figure 10 and Figure 11 illustrate the recommended azimuth co-polar and cross-polar RPEs for the two Electrical Classes of antenna.”

delete the word “recommended”.

Reason: because the word “recommended” should only be applied to Class 1

R30: From this sentence in 6.2.2.1.2:

“Figure 12, Figure 13, and Figure 14 illustrate the recommended elevation RPEs for Classes 1 and 2. Some specific data points are provided in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7; between these points, linear interpolation is used.”

delete the word “recommended”.

Reason: because the word “recommended” should only be applied to Class 1