| Document under Review: | **P802.16-2004/Cor1/D4** | | Ballot Number: | **0001073** | | Comme |

| Comment # | **017** | Comment submitted by: | Lalit | | Kotecha | | Member | 2005-08 |

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 118   **Starting Line #** 43   **Fig/Table#**   **Section** 8.4.4.7

My original comment did not get resolved satisfactory in the last 802.16 meeting.

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The original comment referenced is Comment 247 in IEEE 802.16-05/042r5 (see IEEE 802.16-05/060r1). That comment regarded deletior Subclause 8.4.4.7, which was one of the optional AAS methods.

The resolution of Comment 247 was to reject it for the following reason: "The section was deleted since members identified a number of operational problems in the direct beam forming mode and unless the problems are fixed the section should be deleted." This response ha been recirculated multiple times.

To expand on this point, the mode presented in Subclause 8.4.4.7 was inconsistent with the mandatory OFDMA mode, presenting new fra structure and new training sequences (FLI FLT) but with only a vague description of how actually build them.

Deleting the section does not prevent the ability of implementing AAS, since a well defined method still exists in the standard.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16-2004/Cor1/D4**   Ballot Number: **0001073**   Comme

Comment # **051**   Comment submitted by: David   James   Member   2005-08

Comment   Type Technical, Binding   Starting Page # **999**   Starting Line #   Fig/Table#   Section

Changes such as needed to reduce the lengths of figures and tables cannot be safely deferred to the editors, as was proposed in the resolutions. My vote therefore is Disapprove.

Suggested Remedy

Incorporate all changes, pass none to the editors.

Proposed Resolution   Recommendation: **Rejected**   Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

There is no specific indication of required changes to do. Taking an educated guess that he commenter refers to his proposed changes in previous circulation that were rejected, then please note coordination comment #556 in 80216-05_042r from Michelle Turner, the IEEE sta editor:

"Please note, upon approval of the last balloted draft the document, the following will take place: The approved draft will be copyedited for grammar, punctuation, syntax, English usage, and style according to the IEEE Standards Style Manual." Therefore, the group believes tha IEEE style problems will be handled in this process. In addition, the group believes that doing modifications to tables in a non compatible v to the baseline document in an amendment project will reduce the readability of the standard as a whole.

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

There is no specific indication of required changes to do. Taking an educated guess that he commenter refers to his proposed changes in previous circulation that were rejected, then please note coordination comment #556 in 80216-05_042r from Michelle Turner, the IEEE sta editor:

"Please note, upon approval of the last balloted draft the document, the following will take place: The approved draft will be copyedited for grammar, punctuation, syntax, English usage, and style according to the IEEE Standards Style Manual." Therefore, the group believes tha IEEE style problems will be handled in this process. In addition, the group believes that doing modifications to tables in a non compatible v to the baseline document in an amendment project will reduce the readability of the standard as a whole.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items