

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **01**Comment submitted by: [Carl](#)[Eklund](#)

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Non-binding				6.2.2.3.9.3

[PKM timer values are needed before the download of the configuration file. If they are different from the default they should be returned in the Auth Reply message](#)

Suggested Remedy[Apply edits under Comment IV from document C802.16c-02/09](#)**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: [Accepted](#)****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **02**Comment submitted by: **Carl****Eklund**

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial				11.4.9.3.1

The existence of sections 11.4.9.3.1 and 11.4.9.3.2 is unexplainable. They only serve to confuse and screw up the structure of the document.

Suggested Remedy

Delete sections 11.4.9.3.1 and 11.4.9.3.2

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Delete 11.4.9.3.1.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

We agree with the need to remove these sections from IEEE 802.16.

However, the content of 11.4.9.3.2 from IEEE 802.16 is already deleted by 802.16c/D3.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **03**Comment submitted by: **Carl****Eklund**

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	56	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	------------	---------

The TLV parameter order for REG-REQ and REG-RSP are incorrectly indented. Also the order should be such that all capabilities encodings are consecutive. All capabilities should be sent as a nested TLV

Suggested Remedy

Fix indentation to show parameters being subcodes of SS Capabilities and change order to be as in Comment VIII in document C802.16c-02/09

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Accepted******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **04**

Comment submitted by: **Carl**

Eklund

Comment	Type Editorial	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section 6.2.2.3.8
---------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	--------------------------

Errata: **Correct name of parameter in Vendor-specific indformation not extensions as mentioned here.**

Suggested Remedy

apply editorial instruction under Comment X in document C802.16c-02/09

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **05**

Comment submitted by: **Carl**

Eklund

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical, Non-binding				6.2.9.5
The time to increase power diamond is ambiguos. Also the text suggests that power should be increased every time between transmissions rendering the diamond moot.					

Suggested Remedy

apply editorial instruction under Comment XI in document C802.16c-02/09

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2002/09/24

IEEE 802.16-02/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **06**

Comment submitted by: Jennifer

Longman

Other

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
MEMO						

TO: Balloting Center
 FROM: Jennifer Longman
 DATE: 20 August 2002
 RE: SCC 10 Coordination of IEEE P802.16c/D3

IEEE P802.16c/D3 meets all phases of SCC 10 coordination.

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Accepted
---------------------	------------------------------------

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions) none needed
----------------	------------------	---------------

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **07**

Comment submitted by: Jennifer

Longman

Other

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	---------

MEMO

TO: 802.16 Working Group
 FROM: Jennifer Longman
 DATE: 20 August 2002
 RE: Editorial Review of P802.16c/D3

Upon review of P802.16c/D3, I have the following comments:

1. The information now contained in the Scope and Purpose should be removed and added to the EDITORIAL NOTE. No new information should be added to the Scope and Purpose, unless you are specifically modifying those clauses in the base standard.

The following is an example of from 802.1t-2001:

EDITORIAL NOTE—This amendment to IEEE Std 802.1D, 1998 Edition (ISO/IEC 15802-3:1998) defines the changes necessary in order to address maintenance items that have been brought to the attention of the 802.1 Working Group. These changes are defined as a series of additions to, and modifications of, the existing text of ISO/IEC 15802-3:1998; this supplement therefore assumes all material, including references, abbreviations, definitions, procedures, services and protocols defined in the base text. Text shown in **bold italics** in this amendment defines the editing instructions necessary in order to incorporate the modifications and additions into the base text. Three editing instructions are used: **change**, **delete**, and **insert**. **Change** is used to make a change to existing material. The editing instruction specifies the location of the change and describes what is being changed either by using strikethrough to remove old material or underline to add new material. **Delete** removes existing material. **Insert** adds new material without changing the existing material. Insertions may require renumbering. If so, renumbering instructions are given in the editing instruction. Editorial notes will not be carried over into future editions of IEEE Std 802.1D.

The following is an example from 802.11d-2001 showing a slightly different style:

[This amendment is based on the current edition of IEEE Std 802.11, 1999 Edition and the IEEE Std 802.11a-1999 and IEEE Std 802.11b-1999 amendments.]

NOTE—The editing instructions contained in this amendment define how to merge the material contained herein into the existing base standard to form the new comprehensive standard as created by the addition of IEEE Std 802.11-1999.

The editing instructions are shown in **bold italic**. Three editing instructions are used: change, delete, and insert. **Change** is used to make small corrections in existing text or tables. The editing instruction specifies the location of the change and describes what is being changed either by using strikethrough (to remove old material) or underline (to add new material). **Delete** removes existing material. **Insert** adds new material without disturbing the existing material. Insertions may require renumbering. If so, renumbering instructions are given in the editing instruction. Editorial notes will not be carried over into future editions.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Best regards,

Jennifer Longman
j.Longman@ieee.org
 (732) 562-6355

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **08**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	---------

Std 802.16-2001 needs a clarification. In last sentence on p. 93. 6.2.7.2 says: "If half-duplex subscriber stations are used, the bandwidth controller shall not allocate uplink bandwidth for a half-duplex subscriber station at the same time that it is expected to receive data on the downlink channel." This sentence should be clarified to explicitly include any RTG or TTG.

Suggested Remedy

Add a new item to 802.16c that changes the sentence by adding at the end: ", including allowance for the Tx/Rx and Rx/Tx Transition Gaps".

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Add a new item to 802.16c that changes the sentence by adding at the end: ", including allowance for the propagation delay, Tx/Rx and Rx/Tx Transition Gaps".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **09**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	---------

In IEEE Std 802.16-2001, 6.2.5.4 (p. 85) has extra space in the fourth line.

Suggested Remedy

Add a change to delete the extra space in the fourth line of 6.2.5.4 (p. 85) of IEEE Std 802.16-2001,

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **10**

Comment submitted by: Charles

Ng'ethe

Member

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
The PDF I downloaded had so many cancellations and repeated numbers which run from 1 to 65 for each page.	Editorial	?			

Suggested Remedy

Please provide a document that is clear without cancellations or empty pages which imply there is some missing information.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Delete empty page ii, or mark "This page intentionally left blank."

Set line numbers (1-65 on left column) in color to indicate that they are temporary.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Line numbers must remain in draft for commenting purposes, but will not be in published standard.

The "cancellations" must remain, since they are a fundamental part of the standard. This standard is an amendment to IEEE Standard 802.16 The marks are used to indicate changes to that standard. This is explained in "Editorial instructions" on Page 5. This editorial procedure is required by IEEE-SA.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **11**

Comment submitted by: **Carl**

Eklund

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page #

Starting Line # **266**

Fig/Table# **133**

Section **9.2.3**

Figure 133 omits the pad.

Suggested Remedy

Apply edits under Comment III from document C802.16c-02/09

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **12**

Comment submitted by: Jose

Gutierrez

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **8**

Starting Line # **15**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.2.2.1.1**

A number is written as: 0xFX

a) This is C notation. I recommend using standard Hex notation

b) what is the meaning of the 'X' after the 'F'? I recommend using a notation that is more clear e.g. put a table with a bit mask

Suggested Remedy

See above

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

after 0xFX add the phrase "where 'X' means 'don't care'"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

C notation is consistent with the base document, but clarification of the standard usage of X to mean don't care is a good idea.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **13**

Comment submitted by: **Carl**

Eklund

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **12**

Starting Line # **28**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.2.7.5**

Contradiction in paragraph 6.2.7.5

Suggested Remedy

Delete sentence 'The UL-MAP defines the uplink usage in terms of the offset from the previous IE start (the length) in numbers of minislots.'

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **14**Comment submitted by: **Kenneth****Stanwood****Member**Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **15** Starting Line # **3** Fig/Table# Section **6.2.9.9**

We need to get the figure numbering correct so it isn't confusing. Figures would be replaced by figures with the same number. Additional inserted figures have the xxa, xxb, ... numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Fix figure numbering throughout the document.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Superceded******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

The commentor was looking at older version of draft document. The current draft has corrected this issue already.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **15**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **15**

Starting Line # **6**

Fig/Table# **55**

Section **6.2.9.9**

It looks like Figure 55 should be after figures 54a and 54b.

Suggested Remedy

Make certain the order of figures is correct.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **16**Comment submitted by: **Kenneth****Stanwood**

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **17**Starting Line # **41**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.2.10**

The 802.16a amendment changes Figure 55 and makes the correction here unnecessary.

Suggested Remedy

Delete lines 41-46 and let the 802.16 a amendment correct the typo by inserting a new figure.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

This change simply corrects two small typographical errors in IEEE Std 802.16. If 802.16a makes technical changes to the same figure, those will take precedence over the editorial changes made here in 802.16c.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **17**Comment submitted by: **Kenneth****Stanwood****Member**Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **20** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **8.2**

The comment on line 1 refers to a different section than the previous header that appears in the document.

Suggested Remedy

Before line 1, insert the header:

"8.2 PHY for 10-66 GHz"

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Commentor was looking at older version of document. Sponsor ballot version has this correction already.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **18**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **20**

Starting Line # **6**

Fig/Table#

Section **8.2.1**

grammar and typo in instructions.

Suggested Remedy

change "fourth paragraph(two" to "in the fourth paragraph (two"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Commentor was looking at older version of document. Sponsor ballot version has this correction already.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **19**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **21** Starting Line # **28** Fig/Table# Section **11.1.4**

The value of the parameter can be other than +/- 2 modulation symbols, it just cannot be outside this range.

Suggested Remedy

change "the value" to "the range of the value"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **20**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **22**

Starting Line # **33**

Fig/Table#

Section **11.4.9.2**

[Align the entries in the second column.](#)

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[Commentor was looking at older version of document. Sponsor ballot version has this correction already.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [|\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **21**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **23**

Starting Line # **18**

Fig/Table#

Section **11.4.9.3.6.14**

brackets missing around 24/25

Suggested Remedy

Change "24/25" to "[24/25]"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **22**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **23**

Starting Line # **52**

Fig/Table#

Section **11.4.9.4.2**

missing period

Suggested Remedy

Change "[24/25]99.1" to "[24/25].99.1"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **23**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **25**

Starting Line # **7**

Fig/Table#

Section **12**

The font in sections 12 and 12.1 is smaller than in the rest of the document. The same thing occurs in the first line of section 12.1.1.3. It also occurs on page 34, lines 52 and 61.

Suggested Remedy

[Fix the font.](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **24**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **27**

Starting Line # **37**

Fig/Table#

Section **12.1.1.4.6**

The SS MAC Address needs to be in the RNG-RSP in the abort case also.

Suggested Remedy

Copy line 28 to be also at line 37.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **25**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **27**

Starting Line # **64**

Fig/Table#

Section **12.1.1.4.8**

There is no concept of a default Vendor ID Encoding

Suggested Remedy

remove the phrase "or changed from default"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **26**

Comment submitted by: **Jon**

Rosdahl

Member

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **31** Starting Line # **0**

Fig/Table#

Section

"Replave Figure 85 with Figure 85 below:" note the misspelled replace...

Suggested Remedy

Replace "Replave" with Replace.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **27**

Comment submitted by: **Kenneth**

Stanwood

Member

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**
The ATM Classifier Change Action is missing

Starting Page # **33**

Starting Line # **2**

Fig/Table#

Section **12.1.1.5.3**

Suggested Remedy

Add a line with "ATM Classifier Change Action" at line 2.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **28**

Comment submitted by: **Jose**

Gutierrez

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **47**

Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table#

Section **11.49.3.5.12**

the emphasis "shall NOT" does not look right. It actually may not be compliant with the IEEE style. Ask Jennifer Longman (IEEE editor)

The expression looks as a reminiscence of an old issue -> leave it in the past.

Suggested Remedy

change "shall NOT" for "shall not"

Check across the entire document, I saw several other occurrences

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **29**

Comment submitted by: Jose

Gutierrez

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **55**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **12.1.1.4**

Why do you try to create a table that summarizes all of the subheadings in 12.1.1.4?

The structure of the documment around this section does not look clear. Tables help the people understand quickly.

This section is completely unclear (same with the ones after this one). Try to re-structure

Suggested Remedy

[See above](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The information that is being asked to be tabularized is 6 pages in length and contains a lot of information. It would be very difficult to tabularize. Table 13 (in section 6.2.2.3 of IEEE Std 802.16) already lists the messages where they are defined. Section 12.1.1.4 has a subsection for each message saying how it is dealt with for this profile.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **30**Comment submitted by: **Jose****Gutierrez****Member**Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **55** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **12.1.1.4**

The heading on 12.1.1.4 tries to say a lot of things. I recommend changind it for 'MAC Management Services' and inside this section create a subheading with the topic of 'Parameter Transmission Order'

Suggested Remedy

[See above](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

[Change the title of the header to "12.1.1.4 MAC Management Message Parameter Transmission Order"](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **31**

Comment submitted by: Neil

Shipp

Member

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **64** Starting Line # **55** Fig/Table# Section **12.1.2.1**

Assuming that this specification applies to the output of the SS transmitter and not simply the modulator then 2% modulation accuracy unequalised implies extremely tight tolerances on transmit filter frequency and group delay response. I estimate that 2% peak error equates to <0.5dB gain flatness in the passband.

Suggested Remedy

6% (or greater ?)

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

delete this requirement from the tables 147, 148, 150 and 151.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

We agree that 2% is too difficult to achieve without an equalizer. In fact, we believe the modulation accuracy should not be specified at all for QAM64 without an equalizer. That is why it was not specified in IEEE 802.16.

The ETSI BRAN HIPERACCESS project has made the same decision for the same reasons.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **32**

Comment submitted by: Neil

Shipp

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **64**Starting Line # **?**

Fig/Table#

Section **12.1.2.1**

Tidy up the brackets

Suggested Remedy

(0.5 to 2)dB and (2 to 5)dB

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

change "Step size [0.5, 2) dB" to "0.5 dB <= Step size < 2 dB"

change "Step size [2, 5) dB" to "2 dB <= Step size < 5 dB"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The above recommendation makes the requirement for a 2 dB change ambiguous. Unfortunately, the standard mathematical notation for exclusive or inclusive differs from country to country.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **33**

Comment submitted by: Neil

Shipp

Member

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	67	Starting Line #	30	Fig/Table#	Section	12.1.2.1 Table 148
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------------

Assuming that this specification applies to the output of the transmitter and not simply the modulator then 2% modulation accuracy unequalised implies extremely tight tolerances on transmit filter frequency and group delay response. I estimate that 2% peak error equates to <0.5dB gain flatness in the passband.

Same comment applies to the unequalised 64 QAM spec in Table 150 and Table 151

Suggested Remedy

6%

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

delete this requirement from the tables 147, 148, 150 and 151.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

We agree that 2% is too difficult to achieve without an equalizer. In fact, we believe the modulation accuracy should not be specified at all for QAM64 without an equalizer. That is why it was not specified in IEEE 802.16.

The ETSI BRAN HIPERACCESS project has made the same decision for the same reasons.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **34**

Comment submitted by: **Carl**

Eklund

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **76**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **12.1.2**

It should be made clear that an Initial Maintenance Interval equals exactly one transmission opportunity for profP1 and profP2.

Suggested Remedy

Add subsection as per comment VII in C802.16c-02/09

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **35**

Comment submitted by: Carl

Eklund

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **103** Starting Line # Fig/Table# **46** Section **6.2.9.1**

The figure for obtaining dowlink synchronization is overly simplistic. As IEEE802.16 and ETSI BRAN HA share the same frame pre-amble it is instructive to conceptually spell out the detection of the DL-MAP after a PHY frame has been detected and introduce timeouts.

Suggested Remedy

Replace figure 46 by figure submitted in comment XII in C802.16c-02/09.

Add two new rows to table 118:

SS ,T20, Time the SS searched for preambles on a given channel, 2ms, , ,

SS, T21, Time the SS searches for DL-MAP on a given channel, , , 10s

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **36**Comment submitted by: **Carl****Eklund**Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **265** Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section **9.2.1**

Errata : The TLV format used in the config file is different from the format for common encodings. Also the sections defining the format are written in a confusing manner. The pad byte and the EOF should not be considered configuration settings!

Suggested Remedy

Apply edits under Comment I from document C802.16c-02/09

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **37**Comment submitted by: **Carl****Eklund**Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **272** Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section **11**

Section 11 should only specify encoding of parameters not protocol behavior. Implementation requirements will be detailed in the PICS.

Suggested Remedy[Apply edits under Comment V from document C802.16c-02/09](#)**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: **Accepted******Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**

Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **38**

Comment submitted by: **Carl**

Eklund

Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding**

Starting Page # **272**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section **11.4.9.3**

Errata: Convergence sublayer TLVs are only present in DSx messages.

Suggested Remedy

Apply edits under Comment VI from document C802.16c-02/09

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **39**Comment submitted by: **Carl****Eklund**Comment Type **Technical, Non-binding** Starting Page # **290** Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section **11.3.4**

It should not be possible to set up arbitrary SNMP MIB Objects in the configuration file as this is an unreasonable implementation burden. Also MIB should be massaged via SNMP not the config file.

Suggested Remedy

Apply edits under Comment II from document C802.16c-02/09

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16c/D3**Ballot Number: **0000314**

Comment Date

Comment # **40**Comment submitted by: **Carl****Eklund**

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Multicast polling group CID support and Convergence Sublayer support share the same code point.	Technical, Non-binding	295			11.4.1.9

Suggested Remedy

Renumber Multicast Polling group CID support '5.14' (apply editorial instruction under Comment IX in document C802.16c-02/09)

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Also add tables showing taken/spare code points from C802.16c-02/10

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items**

Carl will coordinate with Nico to ensure a code point is selected that does not conflict with TGa. Carl will generate the table, Ken will double check.

Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions****Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**