

Summary of Changes in Amendment P802.16.2a Affecting IEEE Std 802.16.2

Roger B. Marks
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group

Background

According to the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, an Amendment is “a document that has to contain new material to an existing IEEE standard and that may contain substantive corrections to that standard as well.”

Accordingly, the 802.16.2a amendment PAR Scope includes the addition of new material as well as “clarifications and updates to the existing standard.” In order to incorporate the new material in logical and usable order, the Working Group found it necessary to thoroughly reorganize the editorial structure of the standard. The result was that an editorial “strike-out and insert” format was no longer feasible except by considering the amendment as a strike-out of the basically the entire base standard and an insertion of the entire contents of the amendment.

The Working Group Chair, concerned that this editorial format could be better accommodated as a Revision rather than as an Amendment, consulted with IEEE-SA editorial staff. He received a reply suggesting that a Revision might be more appropriate, cautioning about possible problems down the road, and noting that “if you still want to go along the amendment path, there is nothing that prevents you from doing this.” The Working Group Chair submitted this comment during Sponsor Ballot, but the Ballot Resolution Committee rejected it with a specific rebuttal that was recirculated without further comment. The recirculated material is attached below as a verbatim extract from the recirculation package <http://iee802.org/16/docs/03/80216-03_03r2.pdf>.

An issue has arisen at RevCom as to whether the resulting draft P802.16.2a/D5, if approved, would alter the technical content of the base standard. The answer is unapparent, as would be the case anytime a significant block of material is struck out and replaced.

This issue was analyzed in detail by Phil Whitehead, Chair of 802.16’s Task Group 2, which oversaw the development of the P802.16.2a draft. The result was Mr. Whitehead’s document IEEE 802.16.2a-03/06 (see <http://iee802.org/16/tg2/docs/802162a-03_06r2.pdf>), which was endorsed by the IEEE 802.16 Working Group in its meeting of 15 May 2003.

Changes to Base Standard 802.16.2

As detailed in IEEE 802.16.2a-03/06, the technical effect of the amendment on the material in the base is limited to changes implementing an approved Interpretation <<http://standards.ieee.org/reading/ieee/interp/802.16.2.html>> of 7 September 2001.

Summary

P802.16.2a/D5 is in accordance with the PAR under which it was developed.

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D3-2002** Ballot Number: **000354** Comment Date
 Comment # **009** Comment submitted by: Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11
 Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section

Note the following issue:

Yvette:

We have an amendment (to a different standard: 802.16.2) under ballot. Because it became so complicated and virtually incomprehensible, the editors and Working Group decided to basically put it in the form of "replace most everything in the base standard with this new version." If this is acceptable to the ballot group, do you foresee any problems with the approach?

Roger

Suggested Remedy

Roger,

Wouldn't it have been preferable to make this a revision rather than an amendment? If you still want to go along the amendment path, there is nothing that prevents you from doing this. You may be reprimanded at RevCom, since they may suggest that a revision would have been more appropriate, but I'm not sure whether any offenses would have occurred. Other things may happen, e.g., deferment until you consider their recommendation that you do a revision instead. It would be up to the committee to decide what action they would take.

I would suggest that the easier solution would be to request a PAR change and denote the project and ballot as a revision. In either case, I'd decide what the best publishing format would be. Without seeing the document, an extensive revision like the one you mentioned would probably be best published as the base document with all changes indicated (strikethroughs, underlines, and notes if entire sections were deleted). We can talk about this also next week.

Regards,

Yvette Ho Sang
 Manager, Standards Publishing Programs
 IEEE Standards Activities

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Rejected

The document structure is intended to make reading easier, and this has required the replacement and re-ordering of substantial amounts of

text. Without this , the amendment would be extremely difficult to follow.

The draft is in accordance with the PAR. Now that the document has initial sponsor ballot approval, the WG is not in a position to change the process and is obligated to proceed towards publication as quickly as possible.

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