

IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

<http://WirelessMAN.org>



Dr. Roger B. Marks
325 Broadway, MC 813.00
Boulder, CO 80305 USA
Tel: +1 303 497 3037
<mailto:r.b.marks@ieee.org>
29 March 2004

Dear P802.16-REVd Balloting Group:

Thank you for your participation in the Sponsor Ballot of P802.16-REVd, which ran from 12 February to 13 March 2004.

A number of comments were submitted. Resolutions were developed by the IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access, acting as the Ballot Resolution Committee, during the Working Group's regularly scheduled session of 15-18 March 2004. 220 people, including 82 of the Working Group's 90 members, attended the session.

As a result of comment resolution, 10 of the 11 original Disapprove voters (Naftali Chayat, Marianna Goldhammer, David Johnston, Tal Kaitz, Jonathan Labs, Yossi Segal, Neil Shipp, Shawn Taylor, Vladimir Yanover, and Cor van de Water) indicated satisfaction with the resolutions and indicated a change in their vote to Approve. At this point, the tally is 60 Approve, 1 Disapprove, 1 Abstain, and 18 not voting. By virtue of these numbers, the ballot is considered to have passed, pending recirculation.

We are requesting that the IEEE Balloting Center initiate a fifteen-day recirculation of the new draft P802.16-REVd/D4 (file **P80216-REVd_D4delta.pdf**), with all changes indicated, along with the sole outstanding Disapprove comment and its resolution. That comment is detailed on the following page of this letter.

Please take this opportunity to review the material. You are not obligated to reply; if you do not, your current vote will stand. Based on the changes to the draft or on the Disapprove comment and responses, you may change your vote and/or submit additional comments. If you wish to re-vote or comment, please keep the deadline in mind. Instructions have been provided by the IEEE Balloting Center.

If you were one of the voters agreeing to switch from Disapprove to Approve based on comment resolution, I request that you confirm your decision by submitting a ballot.

Sincerely,

Roger Marks
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

Ballot Group Member: *Nico van Waes*
Comment Type: *Technical, Binding*
Starting Page #: *437*

Comment:

It seems that the reader is left to guess what the PHY mod IE is meant for, especially since it's applied so sweepingly even though it's only useful for AAS in certain cases. There is absolutely no use for it in non-AAS cases, except to needlessly increase complexity.

Suggested remedy:

*Make the PHYsical modifier IE mandatory with the implementation of AAS only.
Allow usage only during the AAS portion of the frame.
State clearly what its purpose is. State for example that the BS should set each shift to substantially exceed the duration of the major multipath components to allow separate detection of simultaneously received (synchronous) transmissions.*

Reason for group's decision/resolution:

Vote to accept the proposed resolution

In favor: 16

Against: 13

Fails (By Sponsor rules, 75% approval required for change)

Reason for rejection:

The functionality provided by the physical modifier IE is instrumental in reducing co-channel interference effects in aggressive frequency reuse situations and allows simultaneous reception from more than one subscriber station at a time. These advantages are gained with relatively minor complexity increase in the subscriber station. It is therefore justified to retain this capability as mandatory.