

2003/10/27

IEEE 802.16-03/43r3

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**

Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **112**

Comment submitted by: Savoula

Amanatidis

Other

2003-10-16

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

MEMO

TO: Balloting Center

FROM: Savoula Amanatidis

DATE: 16 October 2003

RE: SCC10 Coordination of P802.16.2-REVa/D7

I have reviewed Clause 3 Definitions of P802.16.2-REVa/D7 it meets all the requirements for SCC 10 Coordination.

Sincerely,

Savoula Amanatidis

Managing Editor, IEEE Standards Activities

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Accepted

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/10/27

IEEE 802.16-03/43r3

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**

Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **113**

Comment submitted by: Savoula

Amanatidis

Other

2003-10-16

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

MEMO

TO: Balloting Center

FROM: Savoula Amanatidis

DATE: 16 October 2003

RE: Editorial Coordination of P802.16.2-REVa/D7

I have reviewed P802.16.2-REVa/D7 and it meets all the requirements for Editorial Coordination.

Sincerely,

Savoula Amanatidis

Managing Editor, IEEE Standards Activities

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Accepted

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **114**

Comment submitted by: Bruce

Barrow

Other

2003-10-09

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

SCC14 Comments on P802.16.2-REVa/D7

LAN/MAN Networks – Coexistence of Fixed Broadband Wireless Access Systems

September 9, 2003

Table 3, p. 31 – The column heading "(W/m²/MHz)" is incorrect. The notation a/b/c is not defined in algebra. Please substitute "[W/m²]/MHz".

7.2.5, p. 74 – In two places W/m² should be W/m².

Bruce B. Barrow
Chair, SCC14

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**Recommendation by [Roger Marks](#)

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted-Clarified**

(1) Table 3, p. 31 – Replace column heading "psfd dB(W/m²/MHz)" to "psfd dB[W/m²]/MHz".

(2) 7.2.5, p. 74, line 18 & 19 – Replace

"...coordination trigger values of -125 dB(W/m²) in any 1 MHz for 3.5 GHz and -126 dB(W/m²) in any 1 MHz..." with
"...coordination trigger values of -125 dB[W/m²]/MHz in any 1 MHz for 3.5 GHz and -126 dB[W/m²]/MHz in any 1 MHz..."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

(1) Make the expression correct.

(2) Correct an editorial mistake.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

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

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action ItemsDocument under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **115**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003-10-16

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

The TOC entry for an Annex should include its title and if it is informative or normative	Editorial	xi			
---	-----------	----	--	--	--

Suggested Remedy

Change as indicated.

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

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

Adjust TOC entry for each Annex so as to include its title and note that it is informative.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Editorial style.

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

Editor's Actions k) done

Made change in PDF but not in FrameMaker source file. Will pass along suggestion to IEEE editorial staff for more permanent change. Also, added "Additional Material for..." to the start of the titles of Annexes B, C, and D.

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

2003/10/27

IEEE 802.16-03/43r3

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**

Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **116**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003-10-16

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

The fonts for the list of figures and list of tables doesn't match the rest of the document

Suggested Remedy

Change as indicated.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Roger Marks

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Set list of figures and list of tables to Times font to match body text.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Maintain consistency of fonts.

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/D7**Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **117**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

2003-10-16

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	5	Starting Line #	6	Fig/Table#	Section	3.1.35
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	---	-----------------	---	------------	---------	--------

The definition of radiation pattern envelope (RPE) ["A graph that represents the maximum sidelobe levels of an antenna over the specified band."] is invalid, for several reasons:

(a) An RPE must be some kind of mathematical function relating two quantities. A "graph" is a picture, not a function. An RPE cannot be a "graph".

(b) Since an RPE must be a function relating two quantities, the two quantities must be stated in the definition. Neither one is. It seems that the quantities may be field intensity and angle.

(c) The meaning of "maximum" in the definition is unclear. A "maximum" is meaningful only ones states the parameter that is maximized over. The definition literally says to maximize "over the specified band", which means that one varies the frequency over the band and chooses the resulting maximum value. It seems unlikely that this is the intended meaning. However, there is no other indication in the definition as to what parameter is to be varied.

Suggested Remedy

Create an accurate definition of RPE. Begin with the ANSI standard definition <<http://www.its.bldrdoc.gov/projects/devglossary>> of radiation pattern ("The variation of the field intensity of an antenna as an angular function with respect to the axis") and modify as appropriate to unambiguously explain the difference between radiation pattern and RPE.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation: Accepted-Modified	Recommendation by	R. Arefi, B. Lewis, R. Chayer
---------------------	--	-------------------	-------------------------------

On page 5, line 13, item 3.1.35, replace "radiation pattern envelope (RPE): A graph that represents the maximum sidelobe levels of an antenna over the specified band." by the following text:

"Radiation Pattern Envelope (RPE): RPE is an agreed mask defining an upper bound that antenna radiation patterns are expected to fit beneath. The RPE is usually presented as a plot or a table, representing a function of relative radiation power density versus angular offset in a defined plane with respect to an axis along the antenna direction exhibiting maximum radiation (antenna boresight). The radiation power density is usually expressed in dB relative to the maximum radiation power density on antenna boresight in the primary polarization orientation. The RPE is usually applicable over a defined frequency range for the antennas under consideration."

Reason for Recommendation

Clarify the definition of Radiation Pattern Envelope.

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

On page 5, line 13, item 3.1.35, replace "radiation pattern envelope (RPE): A graph that represents the maximum sidelobe levels of an antenna over the specified band." by the following text:

"Radiation Pattern Envelope (RPE): RPE is an agreed mask defining an upper bound that antenna radiation patterns are expected to fit beneath. The RPE is usually presented as a plot or a table, representing a function of relative radiation power density versus angular offset in a defined plane with respect to an axis along the antenna direction exhibiting maximum radiation (antenna boresight). The radiation power density is usually expressed in dB relative to the maximum radiation power density on antenna boresight in the primary polarization orientation. The RPE is usually applicable over a defined frequency range for the antennas under consideration."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Clarify the definition of Radiation Pattern Envelope.

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/D7**Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **118**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

Comment	Type Editorial	Starting Page # 42	Starting Line # 14	Fig/Table#	Section 6.1
---------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	------------	--------------------

The text "(Recommendations 1-1,1-2,1-3,1-10,1-11 detailed in 5.2 equally apply. Additionally the following new recommendations apply here.)" uses confusing grammar and is hard to understand.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Recommendations 1-1,1-2,1-3,1-10,1-11 detailed in 5.2 equally apply. Additionally the following new recommendations apply here." to:

"Recommendations 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-10, and 1-11, as provided in 5.2, apply to the current case. In addition, the following recommendations also apply to this case."

Proposed ResolutionRecommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by Rémi Chayer

Change "Recommendations 1-1,1-2,1-3,1-10,1-11 detailed in 5.2 equally apply. Additionally the following new recommendations apply here." to:

"Recommendations 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-10, and 1-11, as provided in 5.2, apply to the current case. In addition, the following recommendations also apply to this case."

Reason for Recommendation

Clarifies the text.

Resolution of GroupDecision of Group: **Accepted**

Change "Recommendations 1-1,1-2,1-3,1-10,1-11 detailed in 5.2 equally apply. Additionally the following new recommendations apply here." to:

"Recommendations 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-10, and 1-11, as provided in 5.2, apply to the current case. In addition, the following recommendations also apply to this case."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Clarifies the text.

Group's Notes**Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes**Editor's Actions [k\) done](#)**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

2003/10/27

IEEE 802.16-03/43r3

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **119**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

Comment	Type	Technical, Non-binding	Starting Page #	43	Starting Line #	18	Fig/Table#	Section	6.1.4
---------	------	------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------	----	------------	---------	-------

Recommendation 2-4 says "Recommendations 1-8 highlights the importance of good antenna pattern and emission mask characteristics for facilitating best coexistence. Suitable PTP antenna RPEs are described in 6.5." This statement has a grammar problem, in that "Recommendations" should be "Recommendations". More importantly, it has a technical flaw, in that antenna RPEs are NOT described in 6.5. Finally, since Recommendation 2-4 does nothing but refer to Recommendation 1-8. It should therefore be deleted; instead, Recommendation 1-8 should be added to the list of applicable recommendations referenced at the start of 6.1.

Suggested Remedy

(1) Delete Recommendation 2-4.

(2) Add Recommendation 1-8 to the list at the top of 6.1.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: Accepted-Clarified****Recommendation by** Rémi Chayer

(1) Delete "6.1.4 Recommendation 2-4" (page 43, lines 14 to 18) and renumber following articles accordingly:

"6.1.5 Recommendation 2-5" becomes "6.1.4 Recommendation 2-4"

"6.1.6 Recommendation 2-6" becomes "6.1.5 Recommendation 2-5"

"6.1.7 Recommendation 2-7" becomes "6.1.6 Recommendation 2-6"

(2) On page 42, line14, change "Recommendations 1-1,1-2,1-3,1-10,1-11 detailed in 5.2..." to "Recommendations 1-1,1-2,1-3,1-8,1-10,1-11 detailed in 5.2..."

Reason for Recommendation

(1) Recommendation was pointing incorrectly to paragraph 6.5 (no PTP antenna RPE is described in 6.5)

(2) Add a general comment to replace 2-4 by adding a reference to 1-8 in article 6.1.

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

(1) Delete "6.1.4 Recommendation 2-4" (page 43, lines 14 to 18) and renumber following articles accordingly:

"6.1.5 Recommendation 2-5" becomes "6.1.4 Recommendation 2-4"

"6.1.6 Recommendation 2-6" becomes "6.1.5 Recommendation 2-5"

"6.1.7 Recommendation 2-7" becomes "6.1.6 Recommendation 2-6"

(2) On page 42, line14, change "Recommendations 1-1,1-2,1-3,1-10,1-11..." to "Recommendations 1-1,1-2,1-3,1-8,1-10,1-11..."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

(1) Recommendation was pointing incorrectly to paragraph 6.5 (no PTP antenna RPE is described in 6.5)

(2) Add a general comment to replace 2-4 by adding a reference to 1-8 in article 6.1.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

In 6.6.5, deleted " as stated in Recommendation 2-6, " since the reference is obviously incorrect.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

2003-10-16

Comment # **120**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

Comment Type **Editorial**Starting Page # **48**Starting Line # **28**

Fig/Table#

Section **6.3.4.2**

The term "1' " seems to mean "1 ft", but this is not clear. This usage is repeated many times.

Suggested Remedy

Change "1' " to "1 ft" globally. Do the same for "2' ", etc., if such usage is found.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation: Accepted-Modified****Recommendation by** Rémi Chayer

(1) Change "" for "ft" in the following tables and figures:

Page, 48, Fig.12, line 28, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 48, Fig.13, line 60, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 49, Fig.14, line 42, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 49, table 9, line 48, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 50, Fig.15, line 32, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 50, table 10, line 37, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 51, Fig.16, line 29, change "2' " for "2 ft"
 Page, 51, table 11, line 34, change "2' " for "2 ft"
 Page, 52, Fig.17, line 28, change "2' " for "2 ft"
 Page, 52, table 12, line 33, change "2' " for "2 ft"
 Page, 53, Fig.18, line 30, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 53, table 13, line 35, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 54, Fig.19, line 29, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 54, table 14, line 34, change "1' " for "1 ft"
 Page, 55, Fig.20, line 29, change "2' " for "2 ft"
 Page, 55, table 15, line 34, change "2' " for "2 ft"
 Page, 56, Fig.21, line 28, change "2' " for "2 ft"

(2) Change the table 16, page 56, line 33 to read "...HP 2 ft 25 GHZ..." instead of "...HP 1' 25 GHZ..."

Reason for Recommendation

(1) Clarify the antenna size unit, as "" is not globally understood as meaning foot while "ft" is.

(2) Correct a mistake on table 16 that was referring to 1 ft antenna when it should have referred to 2 ft antenna.

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

(1) Change "" for "ft" in the following tables and figures:

Page, 48, Fig.12, line 28, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 48, Fig.13, line 60, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 49, Fig.14, line 42, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 49, table 9, line 48, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 50, Fig.15, line 32, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 50, table 10, line 37, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 51, Fig.16, line 29, change "2' " for "2 ft"
Page, 51, table 11, line 34, change "2' " for "2 ft"
Page, 52, Fig.17, line 28, change "2' " for "2 ft"
Page, 52, table 12, line 33, change "2' " for "2 ft"
Page, 53, Fig.18, line 30, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 53, table 13, line 35, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 54, Fig.19, line 29, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 54, table 14, line 34, change "1' " for "1 ft"
Page, 55, Fig.20, line 29, change "2' " for "2 ft"
Page, 55, table 15, line 34, change "2' " for "2 ft"
Page, 56, Fig.21, line 28, change "2' " for "2 ft"

(2) Change the table 16, page 56, line 33 to read "...HP 2 ft 25 GHZ..." instead of "...HP 1' 25 GHZ..."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

(1) Clarify the antenna size unit, as "" is not globally understood as meaning foot while "ft" is.

(2) Correct a mistake on table 16 that was referring to 1 ft antenna when it should have referred to 2 ft antenna.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

2003/10/27

IEEE 802.16-03/43r3

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**

Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **121**

Comment submitted by: James

Gilb

Member

2003-10-16

Comment Type **Editorial** Starting Page # **58** Starting Line # **8** Fig/Table# Section **6.5**

The sentence refers to part 1 which doesn't exist and to "this recommended practice" which is obvious and should not be stated.

Suggested Remedy

Change "are provided in Part 1 of the recommended practice." to be "are provided in Clause 5."

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Accepted**

Recommendation by **Roger Marks**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Accepted**

Change "are provided in Part 1 of the recommended practice." to be "are provided in Clause 5."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Correct a mistake ("Part 1" was used in an earlier draft version).

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/D7**

Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **122**

Comment submitted by: Roger

Marks

Member

2003-10-27

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **42**

Starting Line # **10**

Fig/Table#

Section **6**

Suggested Remedy

Added sentence to parallel 5 and 7: "The full details of the simulation work are contained in input documents referenced in Annex A."

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group:

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

2003/10/27

IEEE 802.16-03/43r3

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D7**

Ballot Number: **0000642**

Comment Date

Comment # **123**

Comment submitted by: **Roger**

Marks

Member

2003-10-27

Comment Type **Editorial**

Starting Page # **2**

Starting Line # **63**

Fig/Table#

Section **2**

Suggested Remedy

Change "ITU-T" to "ITU-R" in footnote to match citation.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group:

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