

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **001**

Comment submitted by: Bruce

Barrow

Other

2003/09/09

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

The symbol dBi is used throughout to indicate antenna gain above isotropic. This seems unnecessary and adds yet another confusing dB symbol.

Suggested Remedy

Express antenna gain in dB. If clarification is thought to be essential, include "antenna gain" among the definitions.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation: Accepted-Modified** **Recommendation by** Roger Marks

Insert a more specific definition of dBi, drawn from a standard reference. See Comment 019 for details.

Reason for Recommendation

The removal of the "i" from "dBi" could lead to ambiguity and should therefore be retained. The symbol dBi was not invented here; it is, in fact, universally recognized. It is used in documents of the International Telecommunications Union, the U.S. Federal Communications Commission, NASA, ETSI, etc. The definition to be added (see Comment 019) is identical to that of ANS T1.523-2001 (Telecom Glossary 2000) and U.S. Federal Standard 1037C-1996.

Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

Insert a more specific definition of dBi, drawn from a standard reference. See Comment 019 for details

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The removal of the "i" from "dBi" could lead to ambiguity and should therefore be retained. The symbol dBi was not invented here; it is, in fact, universally recognized. It is used in documents of the International Telecommunications Union, the U.S. Federal Communications Commission, NASA, ETSI, etc. The definition to be added (see Comment 019) is identical to that of ANS T1.523-2001 (Telecom Glossary 2000) and U.S. Federal Standard 1037C-1996

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **002**

Comment submitted by: Todor

Cooklev

Member

2003/09/09

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

The recommended practice can be split into two parts. The first part can be devoted to the interference scenarios and simulations. The second part should be the actual recommended practice. The first part should be only informative and the second part - normative. The goal is to prevent situations where companies are in conflict and each company presents simulation results that at the same time are based on the recommended practice and seem to support their case.

Suggested Remedy**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by** Roger Marks**Reason for Recommendation**

The purpose (stated in the approved PAR) is as follows: "The purpose of this standard is to provide coexistence guidelines to license holders, service providers, deployment groups, and system integrators. The specifications will facilitate the deployment and operation of fixed broadband wireless access systems while minimizing the need for case-by-case coordination."

We agree that the simulations are informative and the recommendations normative. However, the simulation results are provided to show how the recommendations were derived. The Ballot Resolution Committee believes that the current document structure best reflects the purpose of the project.

Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

The purpose (stated in the approved PAR) is as follows: "The purpose of this standard is to provide coexistence guidelines to license holders, service providers, deployment groups, and system integrators. The specifications will facilitate the deployment and operation of fixed broadband wireless access systems while minimizing the need for case-by-case coordination."

We agree that the simulations are informative and the recommendations normative. However, the simulation results are provided to show how the recommendations were derived. The Ballot Resolution Committee believes that the current document structure best reflects the purpose of the project.

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **003**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **ix**

Starting Line # **?**

Fig/Table#

Section **N/A**

The font used for the TOC is wrong.

Suggested Remedy

Use styles consistent with other IEEE drafts.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Format the Table of Contents entries without boldface and in a font size comparable to that of the body text.

Reason for Recommendation

For consistency with other IEEE standards.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Format the Table of Contents entries without boldface and in a font size comparable to that of the body text

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Format the Table of Contents entries without boldface and in a font size comparable to that of the body text

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **004**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **XV** Starting Line # **all** Fig/Table# Section **N/A**

Standards typically don't have a list of figures or list of tables.

Suggested Remedy

Delete list of figures and list of tables.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Rejected**Recommendation by **Roger Marks****Reason for Recommendation**

List of tables and lists of figures are helpful to the reader. Furthermore, they have been accepted by the IEEE editorial staff for use in IEEE Standards 802.16, 802.16a, 802.16c, and 802.16/Conformance 01. We prefer to maintain consistency with other IEEE 802.16 standards. IEEE editorial staff have the option to review this decision prior to publication.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

List of tables and lists of figures are helpful to the reader. Furthermore, they have been accepted by the IEEE editorial staff for use in IEEE Standards 802.16, 802.16a, 802.16c, and 802.16/Conformance 01. We prefer to maintain consistency with other IEEE 802.16 standards. IEEE editorial staff have the option to review this decision prior to publication.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **005**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type Technical	Starting Page # i	Starting Line # N/A	Fig/Table#	Section N/A
---------	-----------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	------------	--------------------

The abstract says "This standard" when this document is a recommended practice

Suggested Remedy

Change to "This recommended practice"

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted**Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

Change "This standard" to "This recommended practice" in the Abstract.

Reason for Recommendation

Though either term can be used, we agree that "Recommended Practice" is more specific and therefore more appropriate here.

Note that the document, when approved, will be a "Recommended Practice". However, it will also be a standard ("IEEE Standard 802.16.2"). According to the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual (1.2):

"IEEE standards are classified as

- * Standards: documents with mandatory requirements.
- * Recommended practices: documents in which procedures and positions preferred by the IEEE are presented.
- * etc."

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted**

In first line of Abstract, change "This standard" to "This recommended practice".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Though either term can be used, we agree that "Recommended Practice" is more specific and therefore more appropriate here.

Note that the document, when approved, will be a "Recommended Practice". However, it will also be a standard ("IEEE Standard 802.16.2"). According to the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual (1.2):

"IEEE standards are classified as

- * Standards: documents with mandatory requirements.
- * Recommended practices: documents in which procedures and positions preferred by the IEEE are presented.
- * etc."

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items**

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **006**

Comment submitted by: [James](#)

[Gilb](#)

[Member](#)

[2003/09/09](#)

Comment Type [Editorial](#) Starting Page # [1](#) Starting Line # [27](#) Fig/Table# Section [1](#)

[Spell out the first occurrence of an acronym, in particular BWA, PTP and FBWA on this page.](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Change as indicated.](#)

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by [Phil Whitehead](#)

[On page 1 line27 change "BWA" to "broadband wireless access \(BWA\)"](#)

[On page 1 line 28 change "PTP" to "point-to-point \(PTP\)"](#)

[On page 1 line 48 change "FBWA" to "fixed broadband wireless access \(FBWA\)"](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[On page 1 line27 change "BWA" to "broadband wireless access \(BWA\)"](#)

[On page 1 line 28 change "PTP" to "point-to-point \(PTP\)"](#)

[On page 1 line 48 change "FBWA" to "fixed broadband wireless access \(FBWA\)"](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **007**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **2** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# Section **3**

Each definition has to stand on its own, therefore acronyms have to be spelled out, e.g. BWA in 3.1.2 needs to be spelled out.

Suggested Remedy

Change BWA in 3.1.2, SS and BS in 3.1.12, PMP and SS in 3.1.51 and others I have missed. See 3.1.43 for the correct usage.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On page 2 line 53 change "BWA" to "broadband wireless access (BWA)"

On page 3 line 26 change "SS" to "subscriber station (SS)" and "BS" to "base station (BS)"

On page 5 line 14 change "BS" to "base station (BS)"

On page 6 line 4 change "PMP" to "point-to-multipoint (PMP)" and "SS" to "subscriber station (SS)"

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

On page 2 line 53 change "BWA" to "broadband wireless access (BWA)"

On page 3 line 26 change "SS" to "subscriber station (SS)" and "BS" to "base station (BS)"

On page 5 line 14 change "BS" to "base station (BS)"

On page 6 line 4 change "PMP" to "point-to-multipoint (PMP)" and "SS" to "subscriber station (SS)"

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

Editor's Actions k) done

Fixed a few others of this kind also.

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **008**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **3** Starting Line # **8** Fig/Table# Section **3.1**The term B_o is defined differently in two term definitions: 3.1.7 ["channel bandwidth (B_o)"] and 3.1.29 ["occupied bandwidth (B_o)"].**Suggested Remedy**On page 3, line 8, replace "channel bandwidth (B_o)" with "channel bandwidth".On page 25, line 12, delete " B_o ".**Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On page 3, line 8, replace "channel bandwidth (B_o)" with "channel bandwidth".On page 25, line 12, delete " B_o ".**Reason for Recommendation**This deletes all uses of B_o to represent channel bandwidth.**Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Accepted**On page 3, line 8, replace "channel bandwidth (B_o)" with "channel bandwidth".On page 25, line 12, delete " B_o ".**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**This deletes all uses of B_o to represent channel bandwidth.**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **009**Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **3** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# Section **3.1.18**
 Is InterCell Link the same as repeater station?

Suggested Remedy

If so get rid of one in favor of the other. It is not clear from Figure 1 that the definition of intercell link applies to BS.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

On page 3 line 53, replace definition 3.1.18 with:

"3.1.18 intercell link: a radio link used to interconnect two or more BS sites."

Reason for Recommendation

An Intercell link is not the same as a repeater station. It is a radio link, generally used to carry traffic from one base station site to another. The radio link may use the same frequency block as the BS or a different frequency block, dependent on local regulations.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On page 3 line 53, replace definition 3.1.18 with:

"3.1.18 intercell link: a radio link used to interconnect two or more BS sites."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

An Intercell link is not the same as a repeater station. It is a radio link, generally used to carry traffic from one base station site to another. The radio link may use the same frequency block as the BS or a different frequency block, dependent on local regulations.

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **010**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **3** Starting Line # **55** Fig/Table# Section **3**

The terms defined in the definitions need to be lower case except for proper nouns.

Suggested Remedy

Lower case the terms for 3.1.19, 3.1.25, 3.1.26, 3.1.27, and any others I have missed. 3.1.36 and 3.1.38 are correct because they refer to a person's name.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation:Recommendation by **Phil Whitehead**

Lower case the terms for 3.1.19, 3.1.25, 3.1.26, and 3.1.27.

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

Lower case the terms for 3.1.19, 3.1.25, 3.1.26, and 3.1.27.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

No other such problems found.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

Also deleted unused Abbreviation:

OLOS obstructed line of sight

Also deleted unused Definition:

obscure (or near non) line of sight: Condition in which the signal path is >40% but <60% clear of obstructions within the first Fresnel Zone.

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **011**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **5**

Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table#

Section **3.1.36**

Missing Characterization

Suggested Remedy

add the following text:"The two most important characteristics of which are level crossing rate and average fade duration."

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

Delete definition 3.1.36

Reason for Recommendation

The term "Rayleigh fading" is not actually used in the draft

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Delete definition 3.1.36

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The term "Rayleigh fading" is not actually used in the draft

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **012**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **5**

Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table#

Section **3.1.36**

replace "A propagation phenomenon caused by the reception of a large number of reflected"

Suggested Remedy

replace with "A channel characterization where the received signal is composed of waves with random amplitudes, angles of arrival and phases and the absence of a non fading signal."

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

See Comment 011.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

See Comment 011.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **013**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Tillinghast**

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **5** Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table#

Section **3.1.36**

propagation phenomenon similar to that for Rayleigh fading, except that a strong

Suggested Remedy

replace with "A channel characterization where the received signal is composed of waves with random amplitudes, angles of arrival and phases and the presence of a non fading signal. As the presence of the non fading component goes to zero, the Ricean Distribution approaches the Rayleigh distribution."

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

Delete definition 3.1.38

Reason for Recommendation

The term "Rician fading" is not actually used in the draft

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Delete definition 3.1.38

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The term "Rician fading" is not actually used in the draft

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **014**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **5** Starting Line # **32** Fig/Table# Section **3**

The definitions in this clause become part of the official IEEE definitions, thus this definition is not specific to this document.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the second 2 paragraphs and replace them with a note (see 2000 style guide for help)"The ITU Radio Regulations S.145 use ad different definitions for spurious emissions."

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Replace Lines 32-40 on Page 5 with the following:

NOTE – This definition is adopted for use in this Recommended Practice. For a more general definition, see International Telecommunications Union Radio Regulation S.145.

Reason for Recommendation

As noted in the comment, the IEEE-SA Style Manual says: "All terms defined in IEEE standards are incorporated into IEEE 100, The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, Seventh Edition. For this reason, it is important that terms and definitions have as general an application as possible. Definitions shall not include references to other parts of the standard. An explanatory note may be provided to refer the user to another part of the standard."

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**

Replace Lines 32-40 on Page 5 with the following:

NOTE – This definition is adopted for use in this recommended practice. For a more general definition, see ITU Radio Regulation S.145.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

As noted in the comment, the IEEE-SA Style Manual says: "All terms defined in IEEE standards are incorporated into IEEE 100, The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, Seventh Edition. For this reason, it is important that terms and definitions have as general an application as possible. Definitions shall not include references to other parts of the standard. An explanatory note may be provided to refer the user to another part of the standard."

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **015**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type Technical	Starting Page # 6	Starting Line # 1	Fig/Table#	Section 3
---------	-----------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------	------------------

The definition refers to the "primary rate" but does not define it.

Suggested Remedy

Replace the words "primary rate" with a definition of the term.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by [Roger Marks](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

delete definition of "wideband"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The term wideband is used only once on page 103 and is effectively defined there. It is therefore unnecessary to include in the definitions section.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **016**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **6**

Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table#

Section **3.2**

[Add AGL](#)

Suggested Remedy

It appears in Table 9—Horizon range for different radio heights AGL (in km)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by **Phil Whitehead**

On page 6 section 3.2 add new abbreviation "AGL; above ground level"

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On page 6 section 3.2 add new abbreviation "AGL: above ground level"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **017**Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **6** Starting Line # **10**Fig/Table# Section **3.2**

Add X-Pol and C-Pol and H-POL

Suggested Remedy

It appears in Table 14,15

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**Recommendation by **Phil Whitehead**

On page 6 section 3.2 add new abbreviation "Co-Pol: co-polar"

On page 7 section 3.2 add new abbreviation "X-Pol: cross-polar"

On page 35, line 37 replace "H-POL" with "horizontally polarized"

Reason for Recommendation

By "C-PoL", we presume the comment meant "Co-Pol", since "C-Pol" is not used in the draft.

There is only one occurrence of H-POL, so it is better to simply spell out the abbreviation there.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On page 6 section 3.2 add new abbreviation "Co-Pol: co-polar"

On page 7 section 3.2 add new abbreviation "X-Pol: cross-polar"

On page 35, line 37 replace "H-POL" with "horizontally polarized"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

By "C-PoL", we presume the comment meant "Co-Pol", since "C-Pol" is not used in the draft.

There is only one occurrence of H-POL, so it is better to simply spell out the abbreviation there.

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **018**

Comment submitted by: [Mark](#)

[Tillinghast](#)

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **6** Starting Line # **10** Fig/Table# Section **3.1**
[Add definition for dynamic range](#)

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by [Roger Marks](#)

[On page 24, line 23-25 replace "dynamic range" with "range".](#)

Reason for Recommendation

[The term "dynamic range" is unnecessary and can be deleted without change of meaning.](#)

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

[On Page 24, Line 25 replace "dynamic range" with "range".](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[The term "dynamic range" is unnecessary and can be deleted without change of meaning.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **019**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **6** Starting Line # **53** Fig/Table# Section **3.1**
define in 3.1 dBi and dBd

Suggested Remedy

dBi for isotropic dBd for dipole

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

In subclause 3.1, add the definition of dBi:

dBi: In the expression of antenna gain, the number of decibels of gain of an antenna referenced to the zero dB gain of a free-space isotropic radiator.

In subclause 3.2, change the listing of dBi to:

dBi: see 3.1.X, where "3.1.X" is the clause number of the definition of dBi

Reason for Recommendation

There are no occurrences of dBd in the document. Therefore, no definition of it is required.

dBi is already included in the abbreviation list of 3.2. However, the IEEE-SA Style Manual says "The acronyms and abbreviations subclause is not meant to take the place of the definitions clause. If a definition is needed, the term should be added to the definitions clause as well." The definition to be added is identical to that of ANS T1.523-2001 (Telecom Glossary 2000) and U.S. Federal Standard 1037C-1996. (See also Comment 001.)

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

In subclause 3.1, add the definition of dBi:

dBi: In the expression of antenna gain, the number of decibels of gain of an antenna referenced to the zero dB gain of a free-space isotropic radiator.

In subclause 3.2, change the listing of dBi to:

dBi: see 3.1

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

There are no occurrences of dBd in the document. Therefore, no definition of it is required.

dBi is already included in the abbreviation list of 3.2. However, the IEEE-SA Style Manual says "The acronyms and abbreviations subclause is not meant to take the place of the definitions clause. If a definition is needed, the term should be added to the definitions clause as well." The definition to be added is identical to that of ANS T1.523-2001 (Telecom Glossary 2000) and U.S. Federal Standard 1037C-1996. (See also Comment 001)

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

[also comment on...](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **020**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **8**

Starting Line # **4**

Fig/Table#

Section **4**

Spell out the first occurrence of an acronym, in particular BWA, PMP and FBWA on this page.

Suggested Remedy

Change as indicated.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On page 8 line 35 change "PMP" to "point-to-multipoint (PMP)"

Reason for Recommendation

The other terms were defined at first use on Page 1 (see Comment 006).

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On page 8 line 35 change "PMP" to "point-to-multipoint (PMP)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The other terms were defined at first use on Page 1 (see Comment 006).

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **021**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **8** Starting Line # **44**Fig/Table# Section **4.1**

The acronym TE in the figure is not defined in the paragraph or in the acronym list.

Suggested Remedy

Change to "subscriber terminal equipment (TE)" and add TE to the acronyms list.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On page 8 line 44, change "subscriber terminal equipment" to "terminal equipment (TE)"

In section 3.2, page 7 add a new entry "TE: terminal equipment"

Reason for Recommendation

The abbreviation "TE" is used in Figure 1 and not easily spelled out due to space constraints. Terminal equipment may be connected to subscriber station or repeater stations.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On page 8 line 44, change "subscriber terminal equipment" to "terminal equipment (TE)"

In 3.2 (Page 7) add a new entry "TE: terminal equipment"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The abbreviation "TE" is used in Figure 1 and not easily spelled out due to space constraints. Terminal equipment may be connected to subscriber station or repeater stations.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **022**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **11**

Starting Line # **11**

Fig/Table#

Section **4.2.1**

Extra space in sentence.

Suggested Remedy

Remove extra space.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Remove extra space on page 11, line 10 after "...additive to the"

Reason for Recommendation

The space is actually on line 10

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**

Remove extra space on page 11, line 10 after "...additive to the"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The space is actually on line 10

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **023**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **11**

Starting Line # **25**

Fig/Table#

Section **4.2.2**

The link budget is key to any FBWA system, not just millimeter-wave ones.

Suggested Remedy

Delete "millimeter-wave"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Delete "millimeter-wave" from Page 11, Line 25.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Delete "millimeter-wave" from Page 11, Line 25.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **024**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **13** Starting Line # **38** Fig/Table# Section **4.2.3.1**

Because Case H is not included in the recommended practice, it needs to be deleted from Figure 4, which shows only the dominant source of interference.

Suggested Remedy

Remove Case H from Figure 4.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Delete Case H from Figure 4.

Also, on Page 13, Line 38-39: change the last sentence to:

"With the above simplifying assumptions, the interference to be considered here are illustrated in Figure 4."

Reason for Recommendation

Deleting Case H would be appropriate given the title of Figure 4 ("Simplified model for interference to a FBWA BS"). However, the text referring to Figure 4 should be modified accordingly. The figure is illustrating the "simplified model", not the "dominant sources of interference."

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Delete Case H from Figure 4.

Also, on Page 13, Line 38-39: change the last sentence to:

"With the above simplifying assumptions, the interference to be considered here are illustrated in Figure 4."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Deleting Case H would be appropriate given the title of Figure 4 ("Simplified model for interference to a FBWA BS"). However, the text referring to Figure 4 should be modified accordingly. The figure is illustrating the "simplified model", not the "dominant sources of interference."

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **025**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **15** Starting Line # **24** Fig/Table# Section **4.2.3.2**

The worst case would be when the interfeerer having tuned its power up or the SS having turned its power down.

Suggested Remedy

It isn't clear what is meant here. If the SS has clear air in the main beam, it reduces its transmit power, but this doesn't affect its receive power. If the interferer has clear air to its BS, it will decrease its power, which would not be worst case. I suspect the correct thing to say here is "the worst case can be assumed to be when the interferer has turned its power up."

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 15, lines 23-24, change "the worst case.....power down" to:

"the worst case is likely to be with clear air in the backlobe, rain fading on the path from the desired BS, and the interfering SS pointing directly at the victim SS with maximum power."

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

On Page 15, lines 23-24, change "the worst case.....power down" to:

"the worst case is likely to be with clear air in the backlobe, rain fading on the path from the desired BS, and the interfering SS pointing directly at the victim SS with maximum power."

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **026**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **18**

Starting Line # **26**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.2.2**

The reference is to a subclause, not a clause. In addition, references to a specific subclause don't use the term 'subclause' because that is clear from the notation.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Clause 5.6" to be "5.6"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by **Phil Whitehead**

On Page 18 Line 26, change "Clause 5.6" to "5.6"

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 18 Line 26, change "Clause 5.6" to "5.6"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **027**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **18** Starting Line # **45** Fig/Table# Section **5.2.3**

"As is seen below ..." isn't really below. 5.2.4 is below 5.2.3 and it doesn't provide any insight on how co-location of the cell sites will help.

Suggested Remedy

Change this to be a cross reference to the appropriate subclauses in the draft where this information is located.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On page 18 line 44 delete "As is seen below" and start sentence with "This is an especially...."

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

On page 18 line 44 delete "As is seen below" and start sentence with "This is an especially...."

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **028**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **19**

Starting Line # **29**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.2.6**

These are subclauses in an annex, not an actual annex.

Suggested Remedy

Delete "Annexes"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On Page 19 Line 29, delete "Annexes"

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 19 Line 29, delete "Annexes"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **029**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **19** Starting Line # **40** Fig/Table# Section **5.2.7**

The reference is to a subclause, not a clause. In addition, references to a specific subclause don't use the term 'subclause' because that is clear from the notation.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Clause 5.7" to be "5.7" and "Clause 5.8" to be "5.8" (note: this is done correctly on page 20, line 3).

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 19 Line 39-41, change "Clause 5.7" to "Subclause 5.7" and "Clause 5.8" to "5.8" .

Reason for Recommendation

Comment is generally correct, but the number should be preceded by "Subclause" when it begins a sentence.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On Page 19 Line 39-41, change "Clause 5.7" to "Subclause 5.7" and "Clause 5.8" to "5.8" .

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Comment is generally correct, but the number should be preceded by "Subclause" when it begins a sentence.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **030**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **20**

Starting Line # **38**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.2.10**

These are subclauses in an annex, not an actual annex.

Suggested Remedy

Delete "Annex"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On Page 20 Line 38, delete "Annex"

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 20 Line 38, delete "Annex"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **031**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **22** Starting Line # **15** Fig/Table# Section **5.5.1.1**
Line 18 of clause 5.5.1.1 defines equivalent isotropically radiated power (EIRP). But Clause 3.2 defines it as EIRP effective isotropic radiated power

Suggested Remedy

I believe Clause 3.2 should replace what appears in 5.5.1.1

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified** Recommendation by Roger Marks

In 3.2, on Page 6 Line 35, change definition of EIRP to "equivalent isotropically radiated power "

Reason for Recommendation

Correct the definition to match that of ITU and to provide self-consistency.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

In 3.2, on Page 6 Line 35, change definition of EIRP to "equivalent isotropically radiated power "

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Corrects the definition to match that of ITU and to provide self-consistency

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **032**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**Starting Page # **22**Starting Line # **39**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.1.1**

The units of column 2 are wrong.

Suggested Remedy

Change "/MHz" to be "dB(W/MHz)"

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

In Table 2 (Page 22 Line 38), change "/MHz" in the column 2 heading to "dB (W/MHz)"

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

In Table 2 (Page 22 Line 38), change "/MHz" in the column 2 heading to "dB (W/MHz)"

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **033**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Tillinghast**

Member

2003/09/03

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
ICL is it Interference coupling loss or interference coupling level	Technical	24	56		5.5.1.3

Suggested Remedy

3.2 Has it as interference coupling loss, but 5.5.1.3 has it as coupling level

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted**Recommendation by **Phil Whitehead**

In 5.5.1.3 page 24, line 55 change "coupling level" to "coupling loss"

On page 131, line 35 change heading "Interference Coupling Level (ICL)" to "Interference Coupling Loss (ICL)"

Update table of contents to reflect revised heading on page 131

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

In 5.5.1.3 page 24, line 55 change "coupling level" to "coupling loss"

On page 131, line 35 change heading "Interference Coupling Level (ICL)" to "Interference Coupling Loss (ICL)"

Update table of contents to reflect revised heading on page 131

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **034**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
OOB is it out of band or out of block	Technical	24	59		5.5.1.3

Suggested Remedy

3.2 has it as out of block, but 5.5.1.3 has it as out of band.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

In 5.5.1.3, Page 24 Line 59, delete " (OOB)"

Reason for Recommendation

This retains "OOB" as meaning "out-of-block" and is consistent with the uses of the term in the document.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**

In 5.5.1.3, Page 24 Line 59, delete " (OOB)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This retains "OOB" as meaning "out-of-block" and is consistent with the uses of the term in the document.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **035**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **25**

Starting Line # **36**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.14**

Improper use of the word shall in a recommended practice.

Suggested Remedy

Change "shall" to be "should" or simply delete the "shall"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On page 25, line 36 delete "shall"

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On page 25, line 36 delete "shall"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **036**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **26**

Starting Line # **4**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.14**

The word "center" uses the English spelling instead of the American spelling in figure 7 and 8.

Suggested Remedy

Change "centre" to "center" in both figures.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Reason for Recommendation

These figures are reproduced with permission of the copyright holder. As noted in the footnote, modification is expressly prohibited.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

These figures are reproduced with permission of the copyright holder. As noted in the footnote, modification is expressly prohibited.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **037**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	27	Starting Line #	46	Fig/Table#	Section	5.5.2
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------

The acronym needs to be spelled out in its first usage.

Suggested Remedy

It is spelled out on line 54 correctly, so move this occurrence up to line 46 where it first occurs.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Delete Subclause 5.5.2

Reason for Recommendation

Subclause 5.5.2 does not substantially contribute to recommended practice. It is not intended to represent minimum performance requirements for antennas. In fact, the included simulations show that coexistence does not demand specific antenna performance. Although "better" antennas do help, the recommendations hold over a wide range of antenna performance values. The simulations include at several antenna types, including ETSI standardized antennas and other typical antennas, including some that are described in 5.5.2. Deletion of 5.5.2 will not weaken the document's recommendations. It will, on the other hand, remove a confusing subclause that could be erroneously understood as a specific recommendation regarding antenna performance.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Delete subclause 5.5.2

On Page 20, replace Recommendation 1-8 with the following;

"Choose antennas for BS and SS appropriate to the degree of coexistence required. Examples of typical antenna masks that are satisfactory in most cases can be found in [B1.7] and [B1.8]. The coexistence simulations which led to the Recommendations contained herein revealed that a majority of coexistence problems are the result of main-beam interference. The sidelobe levels of the BS antennas are of a significant but secondary influence. The sidelobe levels of the subscriber antenna are of tertiary importance. In many cases, intrasystem considerations may place higher demands on antenna performance than required for intersystem coordination."

On Page 105 Line 62 (subclause B.3), change the sentence to "Both ETSI point-to-multipoint RPE masks [B1.7], [B1.8] and masks for other typical antennas were employed in the simulations."

Delete 6.3.4.1.

Change the first sentence of 6.3.5 to 'Each composite RPE was compared to a selected number of standards that included [B1.11] ("ETSI Class 2"), FCC Standard A, and other typical subscriber antennas, referred to in the figures as "IEEE Class 2" and "IEEE Class 3"'

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Subclause 5.5.2 does not substantially contribute to recommended practice. It is not intended to represent minimum performance requirements for antennas. In fact, the included simulations show that coexistence does not demand specific antenna performance. Although "better" antennas do help, the recommendations hold over a wide range of antenna performance values. The simulations include at several antenna types, including ETSI standardized antennas and other typical antennas, including some that are described in 5.5.2. Deletion of 5.5.2 will not weaken the document's recommendations. It will, on the other hand, remove a confusing subclause that could be erroneously understood as a specific recommendation regarding antenna performance.

Recommendation 1-8 refers to the antennas in 5.5.2 but in fact supports the case that a range of antenna performance can be satisfactory. The change reflects this conclusion

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **038**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **28**

Starting Line # **?**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.2.2.1**

The tables and figures refer to angles but do not specify that they are azimuth or elevation.

Suggested Remedy

Add to all the text, every figure and every table in this subclause either AZ or EL with each word "angle" so that the reader can determine what is being measured.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

See comment # 37

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

See Comment 037.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **039**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **28**

Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.2.2.1**

The class names do not differentiate between SS and BS.

Suggested Remedy

Rename these classes as "BS Class 1" and "BS Class 2" here and in all usages in this subclause and throughout the draft.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

See comment # 37

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

See Comment #037

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions 1) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **040**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **28**

Starting Line # **15**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.2.2.1.1**

The maximum depth for numbering is 5, not 6. Refer to the IEEE 2000 style guide.

Suggested Remedy

Reorganize the subclauses such that no subclause is numbered more than 5 deep throughout the entire draft.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Superseded

Recommendation by Roger Marks

[See comment # 37](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Superseded

[See Comment 037.](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions 1) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **041**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **28**

Starting Line # **60**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.2.2.1.1**

The graph has "2.44 alpha" while the table uses "2 alpha"

Suggested Remedy

Change 2.44 to 2 in figure 10.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

See comment # 37

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

See Comment 037.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions 1) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **042**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **29**

Starting Line # **15**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.2.2.1.1**

The table indicates -24 dB for Class 2 co-polar at 2 alpha but the graph clearly shows that it is -25 dB.

Suggested Remedy

Change -24 dB to be -25 dB in table 3.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

See comment # 37

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

See Comment 037.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **043**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **29** Starting Line # **57** Fig/Table# Section **5.5.2.2.1.2**

The graph doesn't indicate the location of "beta".

Suggested Remedy

Add "beta" to the appropriate location on the x-axis.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

See comment # 37

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

See Comment 037.

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **044**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **29**

Starting Line # **59**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.2.2.1.1**

[Figure 11 Add note](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Note: for values 0-90, class 1 and class 2 are colinear.](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by [Roger Marks](#)

[See comment # 37](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

[See Comment 037.](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

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

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **045**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **30** Starting Line # **17** Fig/Table# Section **5.5.2.2.1.2**

The zero x location and "beta" are missing.

Suggested Remedy

Add a location of 0 degrees and "beta" on the x-axis with a line that connect this with the RPE graph.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

See comment # 37

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

See Comment 037.

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **046**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **30** Starting Line # **54** Fig/Table# Section **5.5.2.2.1.2**

It seems that the assumption is that beta will not be allowed to be greater than 15 degrees, but this is not stated anywhere.

Suggested Remedy

If that is the assumption, the state it in the sub-clause. If it is not the assumption, then state what the RPE should be if beta is greater than 15 degrees.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Superseded

Recommendation by Roger Marks

See comment # 37

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Superseded

See Comment 037.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **047**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **31** Starting Line # **29** Fig/Table# Section **5.5.2.2.1.2**

This table appears to be for the elevation angle, which was defined in the subclause to range from -90 to +90. In spherical coordinates, only one of the two angles can range over 360 degrees, the other has a total range of 180 degrees.

Suggested Remedy

If this is the elevation angle, delete the entries for +/-180 degrees as they are not possible. If it is a graph for azimuth angle, then indicate this in the text (page 29 line 39) and in figure 13 and table 6.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

[See comment # 37](#)**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Superseded**[See Comment 037.](#)**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**

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **048**

Comment submitted by: [Mark](#)

[Tillinghast](#)

[Member](#)

[2003/09/03](#)

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **31** Starting Line # **48** Fig/Table# Section **5.5.2.3**
Change " of the SS antenna is a factor in determining intersystem"

Suggested Remedy

Change to " of the SS antenna is a palpable factor in determining intersystem"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by [Roger Marks](#)

[See comment # 37](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

[See Comment 037.](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [1\) none needed](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **049**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **31** Starting Line # **56** Fig/Table# Section **5.5.2.3.1**

The terms "Class 1" and "Class 2" are re-used here, but they mean different things that before.

Suggested Remedy

In this subclause, refer to the classes as "SS Class x" where x is 1, 2 or 3 in every location where it appears and throughout the draft.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Reason for Recommendation

See comment # 37

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Superceded**

See Comment 037.

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**

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **050**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **33**

Starting Line # **40**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.2.3.1**

The figure and the table do not agree for the cross-polar numbers at 60 and 80 degrees.

Suggested Remedy

The graph is likely correct, so add a row for 80 degrees to table 7 with a value of -60 dB for only SS Class 3 cross-polar. Put a dash in the 10 degree row instead of -50 dB and put -50 dB instead of -60 dB for the 60 degree row in the last column of table 7.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Superseded

Recommendation by Roger Marks

See comment # 37

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Superseded

See Comment 037.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **051**

Comment submitted by: [Mark](#)

[Tillinghast](#)

[Member](#)

[2003/09/03](#)

Comment Type [Editorial](#)

Starting Page # **34**

Starting Line # **42**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.2.4.7**

[Delete](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Merge into section 5.4.2.4.1](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superceded**

Recommendation by [Roger Marks](#)

[See comment # 37](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superceded**

[See Comment 037.](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

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

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **052**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Tillinghast**

Member

2003/09/03

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
replace 4-QAM	Editorial	35	34		5.5.3.1.3

Suggested Remedy

QPSK or alternatively define 4-QAM in the definitions 3.1

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

On Page 35 Line 34, replace "4-QAM" with "4-QAM (4-point QAM)".
Likewise, on Page 47 Line 20, replace "16-QAM" with "16-QAM (16-point QAM)".

Reason for Recommendation

Clarity.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On Page 35 Line 34, replace "4-QAM" with "4-point QAM (4-QAM)".
Likewise, on Page 47 Line 20, replace "16-QAM" with "16-point QAM (16-QAM)".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Clarity.

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **053**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **36**

Starting Line # **31**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.3.2**

Extra comma following "and"

Suggested Remedy

Delete the comma.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Page 36, Line 30: Delete the spurious comma after "and" at the end of the line.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Page 36, Line 30: Delete the spurious comma after "and" at the end of the line.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **054**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **36**

Starting Line # **37**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.3.2**

"Recommended Practice" should not be capitalized.

Suggested Remedy

Lower case the words.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On Page 36 Line 36, use lower case for "recommended practice".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Duplicate**

On Page 36 Line 36, use lower case for "recommended practice".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Addressed in resolution to Comment 065.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **055**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **37**

Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.5.3.2.1.2**

replace Second Adjacent

Suggested Remedy

with alternate. If channel 13, 14, and 15 are specified channel 13 is channel 15's lower alternate channel should be defined in 3.1

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

Add new definition in 3.1:

second adjacent channel: next channel beyond the adjacent channel

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**

Add new definition in 3.1:

second adjacent channel: next channel beyond the adjacent channel.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **056**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial	37	1		5.5.3.2.1.2

Should be stated in clause 1: NOTE—National regulation and/or international agreements may impose tighter limits than the following and shall take precedence in this case.

Suggested Remedy

Move statement to clause 1.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Reason for Recommendation

We believe that the comment refers to Page 37 Line 25 in 5.6.

We do not believe it is appropriate to remove these note from 5.6.

We agree that a similar statement is appropriate in Clause 1. However, we believe that an appropriate statement already exists there (Page 2 Line 1, reading "This document is not intended to be a replacement for applicable regulations,which would take precedence.").

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

We believe that the comment refers to Page 37 Line 25 in 5.6.

We do not believe it is appropriate to remove these note from 5.6.

We agree that a similar statement is appropriate in Clause 1. However, we believe that an appropriate statement already exists there (Page 2 Line 1, reading "This document is not intended to be a replacement for applicable regulations,which would take precedence.").

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions l) none needed

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **057**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **26** Fig/Table# Section **5.6**

The word "shall" really doesn't belong in a recommended practice, although it is clear that regulatory agencies will always override the standard where the are more strict.

Suggested Remedy

Change "shall" to be "will". The recommended practice does not create this restriction, rather it is it external agencies that make it required.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified**Recommendation by** Roger Marks

On Page 37 Line 26, delete the word "shall".

Reason for Recommendation

Alternative solution to the problem identified.

Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

On Page 37 Line 26, delete the word "shall".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Alternative solution to the problem identified.

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **058**Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **46** Fig/Table# Section **5.6.1.2.**

Replace: The operators are encouraged to arrive at mutually acceptable sharing agreements that would allow for the provision of service by each licensee within its service area to the maximum extent possible.

Suggested Remedy

Replace with: "The operators are encouraged to use principled negotiations arrive at mutually acceptable sharing agreements that would allow for the provision of service by each licensee within its service area to the maximum extent possible."

See for example:<http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/treatment/pricneg.htm>

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by** **Roger Marks****Reason for Recommendation**

Re recommendation of specific negotiating techniques is outside the scope of this standards development project, as defined in IEEE-SA PAR 802.16.2-REVa.

Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

Recommendation of specific negotiating techniques is outside the scope of this standards development project, as defined in IEEE-SA PAR 802.16.2-REVa.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **059**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **37** Starting Line # **57** Fig/Table# Section **5.6.1.2.**
 Replace "good engineering practices"

Suggested Remedy

Replace with more specific recommendation, perhaps a reference to another IEEE standard

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by** Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

At Page 37 Line 57, Replace "FBWA operators should calculate the power spectral flux density (psfd) at their own service area boundary. Power spectral flux density should be calculated using good engineering practices,taking into account such factors as propagation loss,atmospheric loss,antenna directivity toward the service area boundary, and the curvature of Earth."

with:

"FBWA operators should calculate the power spectral flux density (psfd) at their own service area boundary, taking into account such factors as propagation loss, atmospheric loss, antenna directivity toward the service area boundary, and the curvature of Earth."

Reason for Recommendation

We agree that "good engineering practices" is not well defined. However, the remaining content of the sentence suffices to describe the key practices necessary. Therefore, it is best to simply delete the term "good engineering practices".

Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified**

At Page 37 Line 57, Replace "FBWA operators should calculate the power spectral flux density (psfd) at their own service area boundary. Power spectral flux density should be calculated using good engineering practices,taking into account such factors as propagation loss,atmospheric loss,antenna directivity toward the service area boundary, and the curvature of Earth."

with:

"FBWA operators should calculate the power spectral flux density (psfd) at their own service area boundary, taking into account such factors as propagation loss, atmospheric loss, antenna directivity toward the service area boundary, and the curvature of Earth."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

We agree that "good engineering practices" is not well defined. However, the remaining content of the sentence suffices to describe the key practices necessary. Therefore, it is best to simply delete the term "good engineering practices"..

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items**

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **060**

Comment submitted by: [James](#)

[Gilb](#)

[Member](#)

[2003/09/09](#)

Comment Type [Editorial](#)

Starting Page # **39**

Starting Line # **53**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.6.3**

[Lower case "Recommendation"](#)

Suggested Remedy

[Change as indicated.](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by [Phil Whitehead](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

[On page 39, line 53 change "Recommendation" to "recommendation" \(change to lower case\).](#)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

[Repeated the change in other places.](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **061**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **39** Starting Line # **55** Fig/Table# Section **5.6.3**

The requirement of -6 dB I/N ratio is repeated here instead of being a cross reference. This makes maintaining the recommended practice difficult and leads to errors.

Suggested Remedy

Replace "C/N. This degradation ... thermal noise floor" with "C/N, 5.2.1" Also, replace the other descriptions of this in other subclauses as well.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Duplicate**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Reason for Recommendation

We agree that redundant statements do not belong in standards as they promote inconsistency. However, this is a fundamental feature of the standard. We believe that it's repetition aids the reader. We believe it is unlikely to change in future revisions. If it does change, careful editing will allow its update.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

We agree that redundant statements do not belong in standards, as they promote inconsistency. However, the particular requirement cited here is a fundamental feature of the standard. We believe that its repetition aids the reader. We believe it is unlikely to change in future revisions. If it does change, careful editing will allow its update.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions l) none needed

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **062**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial	39	60		5.6.3

These are subclauses in an annex, not an actual annex.

Suggested Remedy

Delete "Annex", 3 locations in this paragraph and throughout the draft.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Delete "Annex" before Annex subclause numbers in the following locations:

Page 39 Lines 60-63 (3 locations)

Page 43 Line 36

Page 50 Line 47

Page 72 Line 19

Page 17 Line 10

Page 19 Line 28 (deleting "Annexes", as in Comment 028)

Page 20 Line 38 (as in Comment 030)

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

Delete "Annex" before Annex subclause numbers in the following locations:

Page 39 Lines 60-63 (3 locations)

Page 43 Line 36

Page 50 Line 47

Page 72 Line 19

Page 17 Line 10

Page 19 Line 28 (deleting "Annexes", as in Comment 028)

Page 20 Line 38 (as in Comment 030)

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

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **063**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial	41	8		5.7.1.2

The order of the dashed list does not match the order of the subclauses.

Suggested Remedy

Move IA to below Monte Carlo in the dashed list to match the subclause ordering.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted-Clarified** Recommendation by Roger Marks

On the dashed list on Page 41, interchange "Interference Area method" and "Monte Carlo simulations"

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**

On the dashed list on Page 41, interchange "Interference Area method" and "Monte Carlo simulations"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **064**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **46**

Starting Line # **50**

Fig/Table#

Section **5.8.7.1**

Missing period.

Suggested Remedy

"mounting structure. Antenna-to-antenna ..."

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On Page 46 Line 50, add missing period after "mounting structure".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 46 Line 50, add missing period after "mounting structure".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **065**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	49	Starting Line #	28	Fig/Table#	Section	6.1.1
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------

"Recommended Practice" should not be capitalized.

Suggested Remedy

Lower case the words. Also on page 72, line 30, page 79, line 31, and any other locations in the draft.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation: Accepted-Clarified****Recommendation by** Roger Marks

lower case "recommended practice" on:

Page 1 Line 41

Page 2 Line 25

Page 2 Line 39

Page 13 Line 37

Page 15 Line 27

Page 16 Line 18

Page 17 Line 28

Page 17 Line 44

Page 18 Line 58

Page 22 Line 27

Page 22 Line 60

Page 22 Line 61

Page 23 Line 19

Page 23 Line 33

Page 23 Line 61

Page 24 Line 6

Page 24 Line 23

Page 24 Line 30

Page 24 Line 50

Page 34 Line 23

Page 34 Line 57

Page 36 Line 36 (see Comment 054)

Page 36 Line 41

Page 42 Line 14

Page 49 Line 28

Page 50 Line 45 [superceded by Comment 067]

Page 51 Line 49 [superceded by Comment 068]

Page 72 Line 29

Page 79 Line 30

Page 79 Line 46
Page 81 Line 6
Page 124 Line 28
Page 131 Line 41

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Clarified

lower case "recommended practice" on:

Page 1 Line 41
Page 2 Line 25
Page 2 Line 39
Page 13 Line 37
Page 15 Line 27
Page 16 Line 18
Page 17 Line 28
Page 17 Line 44
Page 18 Line 58
Page 22 Line 27
Page 22 Line 60
Page 22 Line 61
Page 23 Line 19
Page 23 Line 33
Page 23 Line 61
Page 24 Line 6
Page 24 Line 23
Page 24 Line 30
Page 24 Line 50
Page 34 Line 23
Page 34 Line 57
Page 36 Line 36 (see Comment 054)
Page 36 Line 41
Page 42 Line 14
Page 49 Line 28
Page 50 Line 45 [superceded by Comment 067]
Page 51 Line 49 [superceded by Comment 068]
Page 72 Line 29
Page 79 Line 30
Page 79 Line 46

Page 81 Line 6
Page 124 Line 28
Page 131 Line 41

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **066**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **49**

Starting Line # **33**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.1.2**

"Recommendation" should not be capitalized.

Suggested Remedy

Lower case it.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 49 Line 33, lower case the first instance of "Recommendation".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 49 Line 33, lower case the first instance of "Recommendation".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **067**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **50**

Starting Line # **45**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.2**

The reference to Clause 6 indicates that it is to this draft, the other words are extraneous (and incorrectly capitalized.)

Suggested Remedy

Delete "of this Recommended Practice"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 50 Line 45, delete "of this Recommended Practice".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 50 Line 45, delete "of this Recommended Practice".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **068**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **51**

Starting Line # **49**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3**

There is no part 1 of this draft.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Part 1 of this Recommended Practice" to be "Clause 5".

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 51 Line 49, change "Part 1 of this Recommended Practice" to "Clause 5".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 51 Line 49, change "Part 1 of this Recommended Practice" to "Clause 5".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **069**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **53**

Starting Line # **15**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.3**

Extra spaces around the hypen.

Suggested Remedy

Change to "In-band"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 53 Line 15, change "In – band" to "In-band"

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On Page 53 Line 15, change "In – band" to "In-band"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **070**Comment submitted by: **Mark****Tillinghast**

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **53** Starting Line # **38** Fig/Table# Section **6.3.3**
Nyquist filter alpha is not a percentage

Suggested Remedy

It is a measure of excess bandwidth respect to brick wall filter. Replace 25% rolloff with $\alpha = 0.25$

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

On Page 52 Line 57 (Table 12) replace "Root Nyquist,25%roll-off" with "Root Nyquist, roll-off factor = 0.25"

On Page 53 Line 39 (Table 13) replace "Root Nyquist,25%roll-off" with "Root Nyquist, roll-off factor = 0.25"

Reason for Recommendation

IEEE Std 802.16 uses the term "roll-off factor".

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**

On Page 52 Line 57 (Table 12) replace "Root Nyquist, 25%roll-off" with "Root Nyquist, roll-off factor = 0.25"

On Page 53 Line 39 (Table 13) replace "Root Nyquist, 25%roll-off" with "Root Nyquist, roll-off factor = 0.25"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

IEEE Std 802.16 uses the term "roll-off factor".

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **071**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **54**

Starting Line # **33**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.4.3**

Missing space.

Suggested Remedy

"details of"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On page 55 Line 33, add space in "details of".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On page 55 Line 33, add space in "details of".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **072**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **56**

Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.5**

Misspelling

Suggested Remedy

Change "1Comparison" to be "Comparison"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On page 56 Line 1, Change "1Comparison" to "Comparison".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On page 56 Line 1, Change "1Comparison" to "Comparison".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **073**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **57**

Starting Line # **41**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.5**

Subscript not applied

Suggested Remedy

Make "rel" a susbcript of "dB" here and in Tables 16, 17, 18 and 19

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

Change "dBrel" to "dB_{rel}" in first column of Tables 15-19.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change "dBrel" to "dB_{rel}" in first column of Tables 15-19.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **074**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **62**

Starting Line # **38**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.5**

Capitalization and subscript

Suggested Remedy

Change to "dB_rel" here and in table 21.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

Change "Dbrel" to "dB_{rel}" in first column of Tables 20-21.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change "Dbrel" to "dB_{rel}" in first column of Tables 20-21.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **075**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **63** Starting Line # **41** Fig/Table# Section **6.4**

The words in subheadings should not be capitalized except for proper nouns (IEEE 2000 style guide).

Suggested Remedy

Lower case all but first word, acronyms and proper nouns in all clause and subclause titles.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

Lower case all but first word, acronyms and proper nouns in all clause and subclause titles, including 6.3.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Lower case all but first word, acronyms and proper nouns in all clause and subclause titles, including 6.4.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Agreed
13.8 of style guide

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Fixed many subclause titles.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **076**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **64** Starting Line # **21** Fig/Table# Section **6.4**

The equation had the left and right hand parts cut off, so it cannot be read now.

Suggested Remedy

Expand the box containing the equation so that all of the equation can be seen.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

On Page 64 Line 21, change the end of the equation to "*df*", with the italic "f" replacing the partial character.

Also, in the preceding paragraph, italicize "f" properly, in two places.

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

On Page 64 Line 21, change the end of the equation to "*df*", with the italic "f" replacing the partial character. Change the beginning of the equation to "NFD", with the "N" replacing the partial character.

In the preceding paragraph, italicize "f" properly, in two places.

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **077**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **64** Starting Line # **26** Fig/Table# Section **6.4.1**

This subclause is a repeat of the subclause in Clause 4.

Suggested Remedy

Delete 6.4.1. in its entirety and replace with a single sentence that indicates that the acceptable level of interference is defined in 4.2.2.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Replace the content of 6.4.1 with:

"The acceptable level of interference is -144 dBW in 1 MHz (i.e. 6 dB below the receiver thermal noise), per 4.2.2."

Reason for Recommendation

The reader will appreciate the repeat of the result. This outweighs the resulting editorial complications due to the redundancy.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Replace the content of 6.4.1 with:

"The acceptable level of interference is -144 dBW in 1 MHz (i.e. 6 dB below the receiver thermal noise), per 4.2.2."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The reader will appreciate the repeat of the result. This outweighs the resulting editorial complications due to the redundancy.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **078**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **64**

Starting Line # **46**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.4.2**

Of course "this clause" refers to "the recommended practice", the extra words are not necessary and make it hard to read.

Suggested Remedy

Delete "of the recommended practice,"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 64 Line 46, delete "of the recommended practice,".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 64 Line 46, delete "of the recommended practice,".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **079**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **65**

Starting Line # **14**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.4.2.3**

"multi-link" is split incorrectly across the page.

Suggested Remedy

Probably need to delete the extra space between "multi" and "-link"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

On Page 65 Line 14, make sure that the hyphen is kept with "multi".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 65 Line 14, make sure that the hyphen is kept with "multi".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **080**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical	65	26		6.5

Was it an IEEE study or a study by the 802.16.2 task group? Either way, there should be a reference for the study.

Suggested Remedy

Clarify the origin of the data and provide a reference to a document, e.g. a submission to the TG.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 65 Lines 25-27, delete "These were derived from an IEEE study, with contributions from several manufacturers of equipment and antennas."

Reason for Recommendation

This reference is incomplete and unnecessary .

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On Page 65 Lines 25-27, delete "These were derived from an IEEE study, with contributions from several manufacturers of equipment and antennas."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This reference is incomplete and unnecessary .

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **081**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial	67	15		6.6.3.1

The numbers in column 1 should be left justified to match the rest. Also, change "<200m" to be "< 200 m"

Suggested Remedy

Change as indicated.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by** Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

In Table 22, left-justify the numbers in the first column.
Also, change "<200m" to "< 200 m" everywhere in the Table 22.

Reason for Recommendation

Editorial style and consistency.

Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: Accepted**

In Table 22, left-justify the numbers in the first column.
Also, change "<200m" to "< 200 m" everywhere in the Table 22.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Editorial style and consistency.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** k) done

Used right-alignment instead of left-alignment because the decimal points line up, increasing readability.
Instead of "< 200 m", used "< 0.2". This is for consistency with the table title, which says that the units are km. [RBM]

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **082**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **67**

Starting Line # **34**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.6.3.1**

Don't use "below" in a reference, the figure may not be below the text. In this case, it is on another page.

Suggested Remedy

Delete "below"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

On Page 67 Line 34, change "in the Figure 30 below" to "in Figure 30".

Reason for Recommendation

It's also better without "the".

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

On Page 67 Line 34, change "in the Figure 30 below" to "in Figure 30".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

It's also better without "the".

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **083**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **68**

Starting Line # **21**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.6.3.1**

"Class B.1" doesn't exist.

Suggested Remedy

Change to "Class B1" in the figure.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 68 Line 21, in Figure 30, change "B.1" to "B1".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 68 Line 21, in Figure 30, change "B.1" to "B1".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

figure originally contributed by Barry Lewis

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **084**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **68** Starting Line # **31** Fig/Table# Section **6.6.3.2**

The table (and likely the reference) use the Greek letters for alpha and beta while the text uses the English spellings.

Suggested Remedy

Change "alpha" and "beta" to their equivalent Greek letters in the text (use α and β and change the font to Symbol). (at least 4 locations)

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Change "alpha" to α at:

Page 68 Line 31

Page 68 Line 40

Change "beta" to β at:

Page 68 Line 31

Page 68 Line 40

Reason for Recommendation**Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**Change "alpha" to α at:

Page 68 Line 31

Page 68 Line 40

Change "beta" to β at:

Page 68 Line 31

Page 68 Line 40

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **085**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical**

Starting Page # **68**

Starting Line # **42**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.6.3.2**

Improper use of the word must.

Suggested Remedy

In this instance, there is the implication of a requirement in the standard and so must should not be used here (see IEEE 2000 Style guide).
Change "must" to "should".

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by **Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks**

On Page 68 Line 42, change "must" to "should".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 68 Line 42, change "must" to "should".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions **k) done**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **086**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **71**

Starting Line # **61**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.6.4**

"Net Filter Discrimination" should use its acronym

Suggested Remedy

Change to "NFD"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 71 Line 61, change "Net Filter Discrimination" to "NFD".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 71 Line 61, change "Net Filter Discrimination" to "NFD".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **087**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **71**

Starting Line # **64**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.6.4**

"Terminal Stations" should not be capitalized.

Suggested Remedy

Lower case the words.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 71 Line 64, change "Terminal Stations" to "terminal stations".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 71 Line 64, change "Terminal Stations" to "terminal stations".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **088**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **72**Starting Line # **18**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.6.5**

Don't invent a new term.

Suggested Remedy

Change "scenario-specific" to be "specific to the scenario"

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

On Page 72 Line 18, change the sentence to:

"However, further analysis and simulation has shown that the actual guard frequency required depends on the is scenario and on whether the PMP system is considered as a victim or interferer (see summary of analyses in C.2).

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

On Page 72 Line 18, change the sentence to:

"However, further analysis and simulation has shown that the actual guard frequency required depends on the scenario and on whether the PMP system is considered as a victim or interferer (see summary of analyses in C.2).

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **089**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **72**

Starting Line # **26**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.7.1**

The heading of the subclause isn't needed, the paragraph fits fine under 6.7 as an introduction to the subclauses that follow.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the heading for 6.7.1, keep the paragraph.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Accepted

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

At page 72 Line 25, delete the heading for 6.7.1. Keep the paragraph. Renumber subclauses appropriately.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

At page 72 Line 25, delete the heading for 6.7.1. Keep the paragraph, but change the first words from "The following subclauses describe" to "This subclause describes". Renumber subclauses appropriately.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **090**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Technical	Starting Page #	72	Starting Line #	36	Fig/Table#	Section	6.7.2
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------

"This subclause provides ..." is not true. The subclause is only one paragraph and does not provide anything.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the heading for 6.7.2 and merge this paragraph with the one from 6.7.1 to form the introduction to 6.7.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

At page 72 Line 34, delete the heading for 6.7.2. Keep the paragraph. Renumber subclauses appropriately.

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

At page 72 Line 34, delete the heading for 6.7.2. Keep the paragraph. Renumber subclauses appropriately.

Change "This subclause provides ..." to "This document provides ..."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

In combination with the resolution of Comment 089, this will address the issue by moving the sentence beginning "This subclause provides ..." to the top level of subclause 6.7. It will also provide a more logical structure.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **091**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **74** Starting Line # **2** Fig/Table# Section **6.7.4**

Configure the table so that the header rows are repeated if it breaks across pages. Also set the table so that it orphans no less than 3 rows.

Suggested Remedy

Change as indicated.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Ensure that Table 25 repeats header rows if it breaks across pages. Also set the table so that it orphans no less than 3 rows.

In Table 25, remove the spaces between "multi" and the hyphen in "multi-link".

In Table 25, remove the excess space between "Adjacent" and "area".

Change "note 2" to "Note 2".

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

Ensure that Table 25 repeats header rows if it breaks across pages. Also set the table so that it orphans no less than 3 rows.

In Table 25, remove the spaces between "multi" and the hyphen in "multi-link".

In Table 25, remove the excess space between "Adjacent" and "area".

Throughout 6.7, change "PP" to "PTP" to reflect Abbreviation in 3.2.

Throughout the last column of Table 25, change "(note 2)" to "(See Note)". Add the following note as the last row of the table: "NOTE—The guard channel size assumes that the interferer and victim use the same channel size. If they are not equal, then the guard channel should be the wider of the channel sizes of the two systems."

In Table C.6, delete "(Note 2)" and "From [3]".

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **092**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **74** Starting Line # **27** Fig/Table# Section **6.7.6.1**

Improper use of the word must. It implies a requirement of the recommended practice when it should be a recommendation.

Suggested Remedy

Change "must" to "should".

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 74 Line 27, change "must" to "should".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

On Page 74 Line 27, change "must" to "should".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **093**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **75** Starting Line # **3** Fig/Table# Section **6.7.6.3**

Improper use of the word must. It implies a requirement of the recommended practice when it should be a recommendation.

Suggested Remedy

Change "must" to "should".

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 75 Line 2, change "must" to "should".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

On Page 75 Line 2, change "must" to "should".

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **094**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type Editorial	Starting Page # 76	Starting Line # 46	Fig/Table#	Section 6.8
---------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	------------	--------------------

Use the acronym here instead of spelling out part of it.

Suggested Remedy

Change "fixed BWA" to "FBWA", just like the heading.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: Accepted****Recommendation by** Roger Marks

Change first occurrence on page 1 line 27 from "fixed BWA" to "fixed BWA (FBWA)"

On Page 76 Line 46, change Change "fixed BWA" to "FBWA".

Change all other occurrences of "fixed BWA" to "FBWA" including the title of Figure 1 page 9

(page 1 lines 28 and 29, page17 line 7, page 81 line1, page 82 line 26, page 86 lines 26 , 32, 51 and 59, page 89 line 39, page 89 line 41, page90 line 24, page 105 lines 22 and 45, page 120 line 48, page 128 lines 42 and 44, page 135 line 31 and page 148 line 52)

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

Change first occurrence on page 1 line 27 from "fixed BWA" to "fixed broadband wireless access (FBWA)"

On Page 76 Line 46, change Change "fixed BWA" to "FBWA".

Change all other occurrences of "fixed BWA" to "FBWA" including the title of Figure 1 page 9

(page 1 lines 28 and 29, page17 line 7, page 81 line1, page 82 line 26, page 86 lines 26 , 32, 51 and 59, page 89 line 39, page 89 line 41, page90 line 24, page 105 lines 22 and 45, page 120 line 48, page 128 lines 42 and 44, page 135 line 31 and page 148 line 52)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

There are several occurrences of the same abbreviation as well as the one identified in the comment.

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **095**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **77**

Starting Line # **44**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.1**

Improper capitalizations.

Suggested Remedy

Lower case "Recommendations" and "Recommended Practice"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Accepted

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 79 Line 44, change "Recommendations" to lower case.

On Page 79 Line 46, change "Recommended Practice" to lower case (as in Comment 065).

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

On Page 79 Line 44, change "Recommendations" to lower case.

On Page 79 Line 46, change "Recommended Practice" to lower case (as in Comment 065).

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **096**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **79** Starting Line # **58** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.1**

Recommendation 3-1 is a duplicate of Recommendation 1-1. This should be a cross reference to 1-1 as is done earlier in Clause 6.

Suggested Remedy

Delete this subclause and replace it with text similar to subclause 6.1

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Reason for Recommendation

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **097**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **80** Starting Line # **25** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.2**

This recommendation is a duplicate of Recommendation 1-2. This should be a cross reference to 1-2 as is done in 6.1

Suggested Remedy

Delete this subclause and replace it with text similar to subclause 6.1

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Reason for Recommendation

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **098**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **80** Starting Line # **37** Fig/Table# Section **7.2.3**

This recommendation is a duplicate of Recommendation 1-3. This should be a cross reference to 1-2 as is done in 6.1

Suggested Remedy

Delete this subclause and replace it with text similar to subclause 6.1

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Reason for Recommendation

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **099**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **86** Starting Line # **50** Fig/Table# Section **7.5.1.1**

This subclause is a repeat of the subclause in Clause 5 and can be replaced with a reference and the values in Table 30. This will make the standard easier to maintain and less susceptible to errors.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the text in the subclause, retaining the table and a reference to the procedures already defined in Clause 5.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Reason for Recommendation

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross-referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest.

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: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **100**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **87** Starting Line # **64** Fig/Table# Section **7.5.1.2.1**

This discussion is a repeat of that in Clause 5 and should be deleted.

Suggested Remedy

Keep the reference to D.2 (but lose the "Annex") for the calculations. Delete the rest of the range discussion up to the start of 7.5.1.2.2.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Reason for Recommendation

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross-referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

Request to change "D.2" to "Annex D.2" was accommodated.

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **101**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **90** Starting Line # **1** Fig/Table# Section **7.6.2**

Subclauses 7.6.2 and 7.6.3 are repeats and can be replaced by references as is done in 7.6.4.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the subclauses and simply refer the reader to the earlier discussion of simulation methods.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Reason for Recommendation

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest. The "other methods" referred to in 7.6.4 are not used, so cross-references are appropriate for these

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Rejected****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

This part of the document relates to lower frequency systems. Many readers have no interest in frequencies above 11 GHz and will not wish to be constantly cross - referred to other parts of the document in which they have no interest. The "other methods" referred to in 7.6.4 are not used, so cross-references are appropriate for these.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items**

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions 1) none needed

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **102**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **92**Starting Line # **13**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.7.1**

"bad-case scenario"?

Suggested Remedy

Change to "worst-case scenario"

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Clarified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

On Page 92 Line 13, change "bad-case scenario" to "unfavorable scenario".

Reason for Recommendation

This is better grammar and parallels the term "favorable scenario" of Line 21.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**

On Page 92 Line 13, change "a bad-case scenario" to "an unfavorable scenario".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This is better grammar and parallels the term "favorable scenario" of Line 21

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **103**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **95**

Starting Line # **21**

Fig/Table#

Section **7.8.1**

Adaptive Antennas is listed page 6 line 10 as advanced antennas

Suggested Remedy

Pick one and get rid of the other.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Accepted-Clarified

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 6 Line 10, define AA as "adaptive antennas"

Reason for Recommendation

The term "advanced antennas" is not otherwise used in the document.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Clarified

On Page 6 Line 10, define AA as "adaptive antennas"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The term "advanced antennas" is not otherwise used in the document

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **104**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **96**

Starting Line # **1**

Fig/Table#

Section **Annex A**

The formatting of the Annex headings is incorrect.

Suggested Remedy

Change to match IEEE 2000 Style Guide.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Accepted

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

In the headings of Annexes A, B, C, and D, drop the annex title down to below the Annex designation.
In between, add "(informative)".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

In the headings of Annexes A, B, C, and D, drop the annex title down to below the Annex designation.
In between, add "(informative)".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Changes will then follow the style guide

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **105**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Technical	99	7		Annex A

It appears that the editor is trying to get the numbering of the bibliograph entries to begin with a different subclause number. However, this fails in A.2 and A3.

Suggested Remedy

Number all of the references in one numerical order, e.g. B1 through B100 as is indicated in the IEEE Style Guide.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Number all of the references in one numerical order.

Insert text dividers into the list reflecting the headings of A.1, A.2, and A.3.

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

Number all of the references in one numerical order.

Insert text dividers into the list reflecting the headings of A.1, A.2, and A.3.

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

Editor's Actions k) done

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

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **106**

Comment submitted by: Mark

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **104**

Starting Line # **28**

Fig/Table#

Section **2.1**

Spectral power flux density does not match the acronym psfd

Suggested Remedy

change Spectral power flux density to power spectral flux density

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead/Roger Marks

On Page 104 Line 28, change "Spectral power flux density" to "power spectral flux density".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

On Page 104 Line 28, change "spectral power flux density" to "power spectral flux density".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **107**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
	Editorial	104	36		B.2

Equation B.2 is incorrect; the rightmost term is inconsistent with the term to the left to which it is equated.

Suggested Remedy

Correct Equation B.2.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

Replace equation B.2 and the text below it down to line 50 with the following:

$$"psfd = P_r - 10 \log (\lambda^2) - G + 10 \log (4\pi)$$

where

 P_r =interference power level into receiver, expressed in dBW λ = wavelength (m)

G =antenna gain expressed in dBi"

On page 104 line 22 replace the expression with;

$$"10 \log (kT_o) = -144 \text{ dBw in 1MHz (Equipartition law)}"$$

Reason for Recommendation

Removes confusion between linear and logarithmic units in equation B.2

A similar issue occurs in the key to equation B.1

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Replace equation B.2 and the text below it down to line 50 with the following:

$$"psfd = P_r - 10 \log (\lambda^2) - G + 10 \log (4\pi)$$

where

 P_r =interference power level into receiver, expressed in dBW λ = wavelength (m)

G =antenna gain expressed in dBi"

On page 104 line 22 replace the expression with;

" $10 \log(kT_0) = -144 \text{ dBW}$ in 1 MHz (Equipartition Law)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Removes confusion between linear and logarithmic units in equation B.2
A similar issue occurs in the key to equation B.1

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **108**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type	Editorial	Starting Page #	105	Starting Line #	11	Fig/Table#	Section	B.2.1
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------

On Page 105, Line 11, in Equation B.3:

$$psfd_{\text{victim}} = P_{\text{TX}} + G_{\text{TX}} - 20\log(4\pi) - 10\log(R) - A_{\text{losses}}$$

the "20" and "10" seem to be reversed. This is illustrated by comparison with the example calculation on Page 105, Line 27.

Suggested Remedy

On Page 105, Line 11, in Equation B.3, reverse the 20 and 10.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Phil Whitehead

On Page 105, Line 11, in Equation B.3, reverse the 20 and 10.

Reason for Recommendation

The change will correct a technical error.

Resolution of Group**Decision of Group: Accepted**

On Page 105, Line 11, in Equation B.3, reverse the 20 and 10.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The change will correct a technical error.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions k) done

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

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**

Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **109**

Comment submitted by: **Mark**

Tillinghast

Member

2003/09/03

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **123**

Starting Line # **53**

Fig/Table#

Section **B.4.3**

<http://www.rabc.ottawa.on.ca/english/pubs.cfm> is a dead link

Suggested Remedy

[remove or provide alternative for the derivation that can be accessed](#)

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by [Phil Whitehead](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Replace the link "<http://www.rabc.ottawa.on.ca/english/pubs.cfm>" with the current active link;

["http://www.rabc.ottawa.on.ca/e/Files/99pub2.doc"](http://www.rabc.ottawa.on.ca/e/Files/99pub2.doc)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

[The link has been changed. The new link points directly to the required document.](#)

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **110**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment Type **Technical** Starting Page # **128** Starting Line # **51** Fig/Table# Section **B.6**

Reproducing another document here will lead to this standard and that document being out of sync with each other. In addition, the language used (e.g. "shall") is inappropriate for a recommended practice. The existing cross-reference and web address are sufficient.

Suggested Remedy

Delete all of the text copied from SRSP 324.25.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Revise B.6 to delete all of the text after the first paragraph. Revise the first paragraph to refer to SRSP 324.25 without incorporating it.

Reason for Recommendation

We agree with the comment. In particular, quoting text with "shall" statements is confusing. Users could take this material out of context and misinterpret it. If the source material changes, users of the IEEE standard would be reading incorrect information.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted-Modified**

Revise B.6 to delete all of the text after the first paragraph. Revise the first paragraph to refer to SRSP 324.25 without incorporating it, as follows:

"In Canada, a dual power flux density (pfd) level coordination process is used to facilitate coordination of fixed broadband wireless access systems (BWA) operating in the 24/28/38 GHz bands. The Canadian dual pfd metric is identical in principle and value with the dual psfd metric utilized in Recommendation 5 of 5.2.5 and the discussion in 5.6.3 because the Canadian psfd metric is always measured in a bandwidth of 1 MHz. The dual pfd coordination process was developed to allow for flexible deployment of fixed BWA systems without unnecessary constraints. In addition, the dual pfd process would be used only in cases where mutual sharing arrangements between fixed BWA operators do not exist. The coordination process being used in Canada for the 24 GHz range is shown in the document "Standards Radio System Plan 324.25" (SRSP 324.25) [B1.14]. Other related documents are the SRSP for the 28 GHz band (SRSP 325.35) [B1.15], SRSP for the 38 GHz band (SRSP 338.6) [B1.16], and the Radio Standards Systems Plan (RSS 191) [B1.13]. These documents can be found at http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwGeneratedInterE/h_sf01375e.html."

Delete the following sentence at Page 123 Line 50: "The coordination procedure is graphically summarized in Figure B.12."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

We agree with the comment. In particular, quoting text with "shall" statements is confusing. Users could take this material out of context and misinterpret it. If the source material changes, users of the IEEE standard would be reading incorrect information. The url is deleted because it is no longer active and a new url could not be found.

Group's Notes

2003/09/30

IEEE 802.16-03/43r2

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** [k\) done](#)

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D6**Ballot Number: **0000566**

Comment Date

Comment # **111**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003/09/09

Comment	Type Technical	Starting Page # 132	Starting Line # 15	Fig/Table#	Section B7.2
---------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	------------	---------------------

The equation had the left and right hand parts cut off, so it cannot be read now.

Suggested Remedy

Expand the box containing the equation so that all of the equation can be seen.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted-Modified**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

On Page 132 Line 15, change the end of the equation to "*df*", with the italic "f" replacing the partial character.

Also, in the preceding paragraph, italicize "f" properly, in three places.

Also, in the following sentence (and anywhere else in the draft), add a space a number and the following "MHz", "dB", etc.

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

On Page 132 Line 15, change the end of the equation to "*df*", with the italic "f" replacing the partial character. Extend the beginning of the equation box to expose the partial "N" character, so the equation begins "NFD".

Also, in the preceding paragraph, italicize "f" properly, in three places.

Also, in the following sentence (and anywhere else in the draft), add a space a number and the following "MHz", "dB", etc.

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

Editor's Actions k) done

Fixed several instances of no space before "MHz" or "GHz".

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