

Response to Comments from NesCom Members regarding 802.16f and 802.16g PARs

NesCom member comments are in italics.

Responses are in blue Roman font.

Changes to the PAR text are in blue boldface.

P802.16f:

(1) Ted Olsen - In item 14, indicate what "ASN.1" means.

ASN.1 is a standard format, which we agree should be defined if the term is used. However, this term is not essential. We prefer to address the issue by deleting reference:

In Item#14, change “To provide an ASN.1 definition of managed objects to enable standards based management of IEEE 802.16 devices” to “The purpose of this project is to provide a definition of managed objects to enable standards-based management of IEEE 802.16 devices”

(2) Ted Olsen - In item 16, indicate what "MIB" means.

In Item#16, change “MIB” to “management information base (MIB).”

(3) Glenn Parsons

- is this a CMIP or SNMP MIB? It is not clear.

It is safe to assume that the project would follow IEEE 802 tradition by defining an SNMP MIB. However, this choice was not specified by the sponsor and should therefore not be inserted into the PAR.

- is there an intent to make the compilable version of the MIB freely available?

Yes, there is intent to make the compilable version of the MIB freely available, as is common in IEEE 802. This includes the free sharing of the MIB for all the usual reasons.

- more details on the benefits (e.g., from the 802 5 criteria) is appropriate in 14a

In Item#14a, change Reason to “The purpose of this project is to facilitate cross-vendor interoperability at the network level for the management of 802.16 devices and networks. This will provide network operators with the ability to manage multivendor networks including fixed 802.16 devices”

- more details on the work relationship with ETSI is appropriate

There is large overlap between the participants in the MIB work within the HiperMAN and 802.16 groups. There is an expressed desire of many participants to harmonize the MIB between the two standards, as many other areas of the standards have already been harmonized. It would be up to the Working Group to decide whether to actually develop a harmonized MIB. We do not believe that the details belong in the PAR.

Additional change: In Item #7, change “Approximate Number of Expected Working Group Members” from 100 to 200.

P802.16g:

(1) *Ted Olsen - Item 13 indicates that P802.16e is "scheduled for completion in 2004". Since P802.16e is not yet in ballot, and has a revision of the PAR up for consideration at this time, completion of the project in 2004 seems unlikely.*

The Working Group has established a realistic schedule (including PAR modification) for completion of the project in 2004. The Working Group has remained committed to this schedule and expects to meet it. Therefore, we believe it is accurate and appropriate to state that P802.16e is “scheduled for completion in 2004.”

(2) *Ken Hanus - Item 14: "Purpose of Proposed Project" and 14a: "Reason for the Standardization Project" are essentially the same. Both should be re-written to state the purpose of the project and the reason for the project, which are not the same.*

We believe that the Purpose statement is appropriate but suggest the following change to the Reason statement:

In Item#14a, change Reason to:

“The purpose of this project is to facilitate cross-vendor interoperability at the network level for the management of 802.16 devices and networks. This will provide network operators with the ability to manage complex multivendor networks that include fixed and mobile 802.16 devices.”

(3) *Sreedhar Natarajan - I have a minor concern since the purpose of the project not clearly mentioned.*

See response above to Ken Hanus.

(4) *Glenn Parsons - which architectural models do you plan to reference?*

The specific architectural models to reference (as discussed in Item #19) will be determined during the course of project development.

(5) *Glenn Parsons - 14a is not supposed to be a restatement of 14. This must be fixed.*

See response above to Ken Hanus.

Additional change: In Item #7, change “Approximate Number of Expected Working Group Members” from 100 to 200.